GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATION 17012 JEMAL'S BENJO LLC

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

May 20, 2003

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing was convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 10:09 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS Chairperson RUTHANNE G. MILLER Board Member CURTIS ETHERLY, JR. Board Member

Zoning Commission Members Present:

Carol Mitten Commissioner
Anthony Hood Commissioner

Commission Staff Present:

Beverly Bailey Office of Zoning Clifford Moy Office of Zoning John K. A. Nyarku Office of Zoning

Other Agency Staff Present:

John Moore Office of Planning Joel Lawson Office of Planning Stephen Mordfin Office of Planning

D.C. Office of Corporation Counsel:

Lori Monroe, Esq.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
APPLICATION OF JEMAL'S BENJO LLC	
<u>17012 ANC-2C</u>	4

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

10:09 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And let's call the first case in the morning.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the only case this morning is Application Number 17012 of Jemal's Benjo LLC pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2 for a variance from the building height provisions under Section 770, a variance from the floor area ratio requirements under Section 7701, a variance from the residential recreation space requirements under Section 773, and a variance from the rear yard requirements under Section 774 to permit the renovation of historic buildings from mixed use, that is, retail office and residential in the C2A district of premises 1301 through 1309 9th Street, NW. The property is located in Square 399 Lot 62, 63, 800, 801, 803, and 804.

All those persons wishing to testify would you please stand to take the oath? Please raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give in this proceeding will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

WITNESSES: I do.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. BAILEY: Thank you very much.

MR. GLASGOW: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

For the record, my name is Norman M. Glasgow, Jr. of the law firm of Holland and Knight here on behalf of the Applicant, Jemal's Benjo LLC, the owner of property at 1301-09 9th Street, NW and it's located at the intersection of 9th and N Streets.

Here with me today are Mr. Dennis Hughes also of Holland and Knight, Mr. Paul Millstein on behalf of the owners, Mr. George Robinson of Davis Construction, Ms. Emily Eig of the the architectural historian for the project, Ms. Melissa Cohen of GTM Architects arranging boards and in the audience are Mr. Lewis Bolan of Bolan Smart Associates expert in land economics and Mr. Steven Sher expert witness in land planning also of the law firm of Holland and Knight.

Next, I would like to enter into the record a request that Mr. Millstein and Mr. Robinson be accepted as expert witnesses. Mr. Millstein for construction management. Mr. Robinson for construction costs and Melissa Cohen for architectural — her work with architecture in historic buildings and those documents are going up to the Board.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Also being offered as expert witnesses are Ms. Eig, Lew Bolan, and Steven Sher all who have been accepted as experts on many occasions by this Board.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, a room full of experts. Huh?

MR. GLASGOW: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. All right. We're going to take a minute and just take a look at this stuff quickly and we'll run down -- we'll take them one at a time.

Also, just let me note, of course, as we have cleared the rest of the morning, it doesn't mean all that time needs to be taken by you, but this is going to be complicated. There's a lot of issues that we need to walk through.

So, the quicker we get into it the better and what we'll probably end up doing, there's substantial submissions and I don't need to repeat myself, but I think it should be clearly known that the Board has, in fact, read all of the materials received. So, I guess the point being we may direct you in certain areas that we need to get to fairly quickly and then hopefully, we can move -- move ahead.

So, first, let's take up Ms. Cohen, GTM Architects as being proffered as an expert witness in

	7
1	architecture.
2	MEMBER ETHERLY: And I believe, Mr. Chair,
3	that counsel for the Applicant also indicated
4	architecture and historic buildings for Ms. Cohen.
5	MR. GLASGOW: With historic buildings,
6	yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
8	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Architecture and
10	historic design.
11	Any questions of Ms. Cohen? Any concerns?
12	MEMBER ETHERLY: No objection, Mr. Chair.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any objection to
14	granting expert status to Ms. Cohen?
15	If no objection, we take it the consensus
16	of the Board.
17	Mr. Robinson? Mr. Robinson is coming in
18	as construction management. I'm sorry. I didn't
19	MR. GLASGOW: Expert in construction
20	costs.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, indeed.
22	Construction costing. Okay.
23	Any questions of Mr. Robinson?
24	The the recent project experiences that
25	you list is is expansive and extensive rather I

should say. I'm sure it's not all the ones that you've done. I note some that I'm familiar with. Are all of these historic or most of them are I'm noting just from my own personal 5 understanding of these. MR. ROBINSON: I assume you're reading off 6 of my résumé that was provided. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 8 9 MR. ROBINSON: No, not all of those are 10 historic. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. But, clearly 12 some -- a good portion of them are and it -- I guess this would be -- as it directly to this application 13 14 most of these or perhaps a lot of these have existing 15 structures with work that happens those structures. MR. ROBINSON: That is correct. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Any concerns? 18 Any questions? 19 Can I take is as a consensus to grant 20 expert status in construction costing and pricing to Mr. Robinson? 21 22 MEMBER MILLER: Yes. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Oh, and 24 the ANC -- is the ANC represented today? 25 I'm going to ask -- obviously you're a

party in this case by definition. If you have any 2 objection, if you would just make that known as we're taking it up. Do you have copies of all these materials 5 that have been given to the Board? MR. PADRO: We have received all copies of 6 submissions. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. You've 9 received all copies of the submissions including the 10 résumés. But --11 MR. PADRO: Except the résumés. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed and that's 13 being served to you right now. If you want to take a 14 quick moment and review those. If you have any 15 objection or concerns or questions, of course, you 16 should come to table and voice those. 17 I would delay a moment and let you review those and we'll pick up Mr. Paul Millstein with the 18 19 development company in this application and also being 20 offered as construction management. That's correct? 21 MR. GLASGOW: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 23 MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And any questions of Mr. Millstein? Okay. Any concerns? I can take that 25

a consensus of the Board then to grant expert status to Mr. Millstein in construction management. 2 Is that correct? MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes, sir. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Right. Any questions of the others that have been proffered? 6 We have reviewed their materials in the past. 8 have historic preservation expert, land use expert and 9 The category of the last would be? I'm sorry. 10 MR. GLASGOW: Land economics. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Land economics. Any 12 questions? 13 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: No objections. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any objections? 15 Then we do have a room full experts. Let's move ahead. 16 17 MR. GLASGOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 light of your discussion and it was a -- a matter that 19 -- that we as a team had discussed prior to coming to 20 We -- we have also reviewed the two the hearing. 21 reports from the Office of Planning. 22 We have reviewed the reports from the DDOT 23 and now, we understand and one thing that I wanted to 24 clarify that -- and I think the record is clear now, 25 but I wanted confirmation from the Board that there is

no parking or loading variance request required in this case and I believe that there was a submission also from the Historic Preservation Branch and the sign-off from there that -- that this is a project that involves historic buildings that contribute to the historic district and that was submitted by Mr. Callcott.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And we do -- we do have all of that information.

You're not asserting the fact though that DDOT would establish whether zoning was correct or not in its designation?

MR. GLASGOW: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: They're just concurring the opinion that as a contributing structures that, therefore, parking and loading would not be required.

Let's bring it up now. I mean we need to

-- I think this is an issue that needs to be

addressed. It's a -- it's a complicated one based on

lots of things.

First of all, on previous procedure let's say in the city and how things are viewed. The Board has taken great time in looking at this and reading -- re-reading and discussing and perhaps even arguing a

bit about the parking regulations. Let me turn everyone's attention so that 2 3 we're all looking at the same thing. The 2001.5. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think it's 2100.5 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Rather 2100. MR. GLASGOW: 2100.5. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: .5. Which would 8 bring us to the parking and, of course, it starts out 9 to say no additional parking spaces shall be required 10 for historic landmark or a building or structure 11 located in a historic district that is certified by 12 the historic preservation officer state as 13 contributing to the character of the historic 14 district. 15 That's, in fact, what you're relying on Is that correct? 16 today. 17 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct and if we 18 need to put into the record, Mr. Millstein and Ms. Eig 19 can testify that there are no existing parking spaces 20 on --21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 22 MR. GLASGOW: -- any of the properties. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think that's where to be very complicated in the broader 24 25 spectrum of things and it seems to make some logic in looking at 2100.5 and that is you have a historic building. It wasn't built with parking and -- and now you're coming along and trying to do something with it. How are you being asked to -- or how could you conceivably provide parking? I mean most -- a lot of buildings that are contributing in some of the historic districts are nonconforming in many aspects.

Oftentimes lot occupancy is quite substantial if not 100 percent.

However, the Board has to continue reading and has to look at 2100.6, also 2100.7.

Let me open this up to -- to the Board for -- well, actually --

MR. GLASGOW: Well, can we make our -- you want us to make our presentation on that?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, why don't you -- indeed, why don't you do that?

MR. GLASGOW: Okay. Sure. The specific provision in the regulations that deals with parking and historic structures is 2100.5 and if it did not apply to buildings where an addition was made, you could just rely on the provisions in Title 20 or otherwise where you would not be -- if you weren't changing anything, you wouldn't be required to provide any -- any parking.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You mean if you weren't changing use or intensity?

MR. GLASGOW: Or the -- or the building. That's right. You couldn't be required to provide parking.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's correct.

MR. GLASGOW: So, the only construct under which this section makes any sense is if there is something being done with the property.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

MR. GLASGOW: Right. That there's been some change and that's anticipated and we have had many, many projects that have been reviewed by this Board where there has been no parking relief required or requested or loading relief when there has been a historic building that's either a landmark or has been certified as contributing to the historic district and I guess if the Board wants to leave the record open for that, we could submit a multitude of past BZA applications where that has been done including the Evening Star building, buildings at 910 and 916 F Street, 920 to 930 F Street. I'm thinking of just some that I've been to the Board in the past few years where there's just no parking required with the addition.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	15
1	With the Zoning Commission, the Woodward
2	Lothrop, PUD where we added, what, about 70,000 square
3	feet to the top. No no parking or loading required
4	there.
5	Mr. Sher
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I mean I
7	think the Board's fairly familiar with a lot of the
8	cases that have happened and and that's why I I
9	started out saying one, there was there has been a
10	procedure. There has been a certain understanding.
11	How do you reconcile though looking at
12	2100.6 and you've touched on when things are
13	intensified be it use or
14	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: other. Is that
16	independent? Does that does that separate out?
17	That's about all other buildings that aren't historic?
18	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, that's correct. This
19	was
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's the way you
21	read it?
22	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, this was put in here
23	for the historic buildings.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Was?
25	MR. GLASGOW: 2100.5.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: .5 was historic. MR. GLASGOW: With -- with historic. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 2100.6 is for --MR. GLASGOW: .6 is for all others. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: All those other nonhistoric, noncontributing buildings. 6 MR. GLASGOW: Right. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's an 9 interesting way to read it. 10 Questions? 11 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Mr. Chairman, as you 12 -- when you began, you said, you know, we need to look at it -- a section of the ordinance in its entirety 13 14 and I -- I don't think that we can ignore 2100.7 which 15 says that when a building has been increased by more 16 than 25 percent, that there is a parking requirement 17 for the addition and I don't know what the past 18 practice has been. 19 I -- I don't believe I sat on any of those 20 decisions where there was a blanket waiver given for 21 parking spaces because a portion of the structure was considered historic and I think the intention -- and I 22 23 think if you look at the history of the Zoning 24 Commission in putting these provisions in place, that

it was considered redundant to -- to have in a single

- in a single provision to make it clear that 2100.7
also applied to historic structures because the
section is to be read in its entirety.
So, I think there is a requirement for
parking for the addition notwithstanding
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There are sections
n the regulations that give exemptions in an
ndividual individual subsection of the section and
f the the exceptions aren't overridden by
requirements through the rest of the section.
I mean I think I think this is it's
fairly interesting and perhaps even correct, but I'm
ot sure how you reconcile when all of a sudden the
regulations start specifying other ages of buildings.
You know, I mean, 2100.6, I don't follow the logic of
viving a date for buildings if it was, in fact, to
nclude historic.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm not focusing on
2100.6. I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm focusing on
2100.7.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think the idea was
and we can we can research this further if you

like, but the idea was that if you have a structure and it is constrained because it's historic and it's going to be more or less retained as it, then -- then imposing a parking requirement if you change the use or make a minor addition, that's not -- that's counterproductive to preservation.

But, then when you have a situation where there's the capacity to add some significant amount of density and maybe I quess it was determined in the past that that was 25 percent, then there's a new opportunity to require parking because there's obviously -- there's fewer constraints on a site where you could build at least 25 percent additional density.

Now, if the site is -- continues to be constrained, that's where the variance case must be made, but I think that was the intent.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Hum.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I mean there's plenty of examples that you can take it to the -- sort of to the absurd -- to an absurd level and I -- and I don't think that was the intent.

For instance, the Deminae Building, which is a relatively small structure to which a large office building was added. There's a building down at

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7th and Indiana Avenue where a similar -- a similar situation took place.

I think that there was the intent that there would be a waiver of parking for the office building addition that's attached to a relative small building. That's sort of taking it to an extreme. But, I think that makes the point.

MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman, could I add a couple of things?

One, under the maxims of statutory construction, you know, there's a provision that specifically applies to an instance. It controls over anything else that -- that may seem to conflict with it particularly when the regulations at a whole can be read to consistently apply and I know with the -- the consistent application has been the application that we're talking about today.

And it says in 2100.5 and if this were to be rewritten, it should have been written in a different way to be more consistent with -- with the other interpretation that's being suggested. That's why we started out with the factual condition here.

No -- no additional parking spaces shall be required for a historic landmark or a building or structure located in a historic district that is certified by

the state historic preservation officer as to the character of that historic 2 contributing district. We have that situation. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: But, let's not -let's not read that in isolation because --8 MR. GLASGOW: No, but I --9 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- but -- but what 10 comes before it is what sets it in motion which is 11 2100.4 which says except as provided in 2100.5. 12 2100.5 doesn't stand on its own and --13 MR. GLASGOW: That's just where I was 14 going Ms. Mitten. 15 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: MR. GLASGOW: I was going to say it should 16 have said underneath here. That's why I said there 17 18 should have been another provision that said for 19 2100.5. It should have said except as provided in 2100.6 or 2100.7 and it doesn't do that. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 22 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: But -but the 23 trigger is 2100.4 and the trigger is a use change not 24 a physical addition to the building.

So, 2100.5 only applies when you change

the use.

MR. GLASGOW: Well, we are changing the use of some of these buildings.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: But, the trigger for the -- for the additional parking is increasing the -- the size by more than 25 percent. It's not a use change that triggers it. It's something else.

So, I don't think you can read 2100.5 on its own.

MR. GLASGOW: Well, I can only say that the Zoning Administrator's office and the Board of Zoning Adjustment has consistently for the past few years. I think if it's something that the commission wants to take up and deal with for in the future, I mean I can understand that and have -- have the debate and the discussion and have a -- have a new interpretation or revision in the regulations.

But, these regulations went into effect in the 1980s and now to come in this application suddenly and say well, you have a new standard with respect to the consistent interpretation of this provision and the regulations as a whole as they apply to historic buildings and landmarks that can -- historic buildings that contribute to the historic district is something that's -- it certainly different than what the Board

and the Commission have done in the past.

I mean there has been a clear line of consistent interpretation of these provisions in this fashion.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I can't -- I can't speak to that because I don't believe that -- that I as a Board member have ever made that interpretation and I -- I would just recommend to the Chair that at least today, I -- I don't know what the past history is and you have participated in many more Board of Zoning Adjustment cases than I have, but I am unwilling to make that interpretation and the rest of the Board can do what they will.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Correct and when I opened up in saying that there's -- there's been past procedure, I don't just mean the -- the rulings of the BZA, but I think Mr. Glasgow's brought it up in terms of the Zoning Administrator's interpretation and reading of the regulations and -- and the common practice is really what I was going to.

I think what we need to do first of all we'll get to, but Office of Planning has laid out the parking test and has said that it is a fairly strong test for the Board to look at.

I would like to do this. Unless the Board

is -- is prepared to decide this at this moment, which I will gladly hear discussion on, I'd like to move ahead with the application and you can -- I'm sure, Mr. Glasgow, you have the ability to address the parking.

MR. GLASGOW: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And will do that and in our decision making, we can finally decide what or whether this application is to be amended to have the parking included. That would mean, of course, that we would -- or I would ask for additional briefing if you'd like, Mr. Glasgow, to -- on the historic parking.

MR. GLASGOW: Well, I think that we would be prepared between the architects -- the architectural historian and the Applicant to address the size of the lot and that we need a parking -- a waiver from the parking requirements and a waiver from the loading requirements.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

MR. GLASGOW: We can -- we can touch on those issues today and I know that the Office of Planning report discusses it in -- in part.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. You know, that's what I want to do. We'll -- we'll address it

NEAL R. GROSS

today in the application. Then before we decide this, we will be definitive of whether the application is changed to reflect parking or not and I think --

MR. GLASGOW: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- the Board will be very definitive in that.

So, that being said, let's move ahead unless there's other questions. Good. Let's -- let's go.

MR. GLASGOW: With respect to the application and this is -- this is really for the members of the Board, we -- we have reviewed all of the reports as I was discussing before and the case at this point in time where there is disagreement between the Office of Planning's position and the Applicant's position is the use of the third floor.

We are prepared to go through as much detail as the Board desires with respect to the other variances that have been requested, but I note the Office of Planning report is supportive of all those including the FAR variance and the height variance and the rear yard variance and then the question is within the FAR variance, the use of the third floor is -- is the question.

And we're at the Board's disposal on that

as to how much additional information the Board deems that its needs on those other issues or whether the Board would want us to focus on the third floor.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think a good way to address this and all of them is I know you've -- you've put in the written documents, but I would address on the -- in the public hearing, the -- the tests for all of the variances and then speak to how the FAR -- the increase FAR fulfills those aspects of the application. Obviously, the uniqueness, et cetera.

MR. GLASGOW: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What's moving you to increase the FAR on this?

MR. GLASGOW: All right. We will -- we will touch on those issues. I understand that the -- the statement of Applicant is a part of the record in the case.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Correct.

MR. GLASGOW: And we would encourage the Board during the testimony of the witnesses if there is some area that you want us to dwell on a little bit further obviously to -- because we've got a lot of witnesses and we've got a lot of testimony. I want to make sure that the questions -- normally we go through

the panel --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MR. GLASGOW: -- and then we get all the questions at the end. I've -- if the Board desires --5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We'll -- not to 6 worry. MR. GLASGOW: -- we can go ahead. Move on 8 that. All right. 9 We also note that the Advisory 10 Neighborhood Commission is in support of 11 application. Mr. Padro is here to testify in support 12 and also, significantly with respect to this -- to the 13 issue on the third floor, we will be submitting a set of revised third floor plans today that the architect 14 15 has worked on. 16 We have been talking with Mr. Moore of the Office of Planning. We believe that we have a way of 17 -- well, we are addressing the concern which was the 18 19 split between the commercial and the residential with 20 respect to the FAR variance. The overall FAR variance 21 is supported by the Office of Planning. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Understand. 23 MR. GLASGOW: The question is -the 24 question is what percentage is office and 25 percentage -- and they're suggesting convert the third

floor from office to residential. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And that with the --3 that's what the revised plans are going to show? MR. GLASGOW: The revised plans will show 5 that we will -- we have developed a floor plan which will convert half of the third floor to residential 6 and half would be office. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. 8 9 MR. GLASGOW: So, we are moving in the 10 direction that the Office of Planning has requested. 11 They are -- they have encouraged us in those efforts 12 and encouraged us to -- to file these plans for the Board's consideration today on that matter. 13 And with that submission which will be 14 15 made by -- Mr. Millstein will introduce the plans and 16 then we will have -- Melissa will -- will testify as 17 to them and explain the plans. We originally had a commercial FAR in the 18 19 project. I'm sorry. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Go ahead. 21 MR. GLASGOW: We -- the original -- the 22 original proposal of the Applicant was for 23 commercial FAR. That would be reduced to 2.39 commercial FAR. 24 25 The Office of Planning with -- with the

two floors that they're suggesting would be at about 2 That's -- that's their most recent report. 2 FAR. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Two FAR residential? MR. GLASGOW: No, 2 FAR commercial. 5 on the commercial side right now. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. 6 Okay. MR. GLASGOW: Our original proposal was 2.96. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 2.96. Right. 10 MR. GLASGOW: Their -- their report into 11 the record was saying due to the first two floors 12 which are about 100 percent lot occupancy. So, 13 there's -- I'm going to call that about 2 FAR. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got you. 15 MR. GLASGOW: All right. And then with revised Applicant's proposal today, 16 we have reduced the 2.96 to 2.39 FAR of commercial. 17 18 With respect to the residential, 19 initial submission was about .86 FAR. That's going to 20 be increased by about a half an FAR to 1.36 FAR. 21 that's being increased from .86 to 1.36 FAR. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 23 MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Moore, I'm going through the -- the FAR changes with the revised -- for the 24 25 revision that we've been talking about.

1	Just very briefly, we were at 2.96 FAR
2	commercial. OP was at about 2 FAR commercial. With
3	the revised plans, we're at 2.39 FAR commercial with
4	splitting the third floor.
5	On the residential end, the original
6	proposal was .86 FAR and with the half an FAR
7	increase, we would then be at 1.36 FAR.
8	And we will be submitting those plans for
9	the Board's consideration today.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Two things.
11	Going back to the parking while you're doing all these
12	calculations, do you have a breakout of the increase
13	of the addition in proportion to the original
14	building?
15	MR. GLASGOW: I will have let's see.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just yes or no. I
17	mean
18	MR. GLASGOW: No, I don't have that. But,
19	we can
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. That's
21	something we'll need while I think of it.
22	MR. GLASGOW: There will be enough
23	witnesses that we will be able to provide that.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Then the other
25	thing, let's let's take FAR right now and so

the

the

to

MR. GLASGOW: Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- why don't you walk through the whole piece. Lay out again the written submission in terms of the test and then we'll just start addressing --MR. GLASGOW: Sure. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- both of issues within that --8 MR. GLASGOW: All right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- one the increase and one the use or the distribution I should say. MR. **GLASGOW:** Yes, that will be done 13 through several of the witnesses. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 15 MR. GLASGOW: With respect to the state of 16 issues related to the property, 17 property, the work with the -- with the community and with the Historic Preservation Review Board all led to 18 19 the building. I'm just now talking about the envelope 20 of the building that we have here today and, Mr. Millstein, would you please identify yourself for the 22 record and talk about the building's characteristics

MR. MILLSTEIN: Good morning. Paul Millstein, Vice President of Douglas Development

and respond to that question.

3

5

9

10

11

12

21

23

24

Corporation and my functions and duty with the company for the last 14 years have been predominately the acquisition of properties and then the redevelopment and repositioning of those properties once they're complete.

I've handled all the historic projects for this company in the last 14 years which is quite a few of them, the park and shop and the Spy Museum and we're doing Woodies now and tax credit projects and 7th Street, the block of the MCI Center. Some -- some real good stuff.

This project we acquired it approximately three years ago and I really never even looked at it prior to buying it. It was handled by the owner of the company which is not atypical.

When I first came to it, I got a call from HPRB. Steve Callcott was in the neighborhood and a gentleman named Clark Ray who works up in that neighborhood and said you've got a big problem out there. These buildings are falling down. There was a lot of trash and debris in the rear lots. There was people living in them. He was trying to get them boarded up and cleaned out.

We went up there right there away and had a meeting and saw that a couple rears of the buildings

were in horrible shape and were actually falling in.

So, we immediately called Emily Eig of HT Traceries to

-- to get some historical documentation in place and
we began to stabilize the structures.

And what I -- what I came to realize that these are some magnificent buildings in horrible shape. The wood had been completely deteriorated. The roofs had been left in disrepair for years. The mortar joints were turned to dust. They had trees growing out of the inside of the buildings and I knew we had quite a challenge on our hands to restore these buildings.

This project -- at the time they brought the building inspector up, Mr. Juan Scott, and really considered condemning them and razing them. They -- they were that much of a hazard falling into the street. There's a lot of construction going on at the Convention Center at the time and we didn't want to see that happen.

Now, I can tell you that from a development standpoint, I don't need to tell you. That's -- that's an advantageous situation if they were to be condemned and razed because we've be starting from a piece of ground.

But, that's not what we do at Douglas

Development. We've never razed an historic structure in -- in the history of our company. We happen to think these buildings are magnificent. They just need a lot of work and time and money.

So, then we began the process of looking at what we could do to restore these buildings and still make a viable economic project out of this block.

We've spent two years with the community. I've been to those community meetings for two years working out a project that made everybody happy we believe. In -- in fact, we have because we've gotten unanimous support from all the ANC single member districts and all the community members in the area. Not one bad thing about it.

We think it's a neat, boutiquy project, but at the end of the day, the success of the project and whether it goes forward or not is not determined by this Board or by this developer but by the lenders. We can't finance these projects out of cash out of pocket. They have to be financeable. They have to stand on their own to meet a lender's scrutiny so that they can be developed.

This is a substantial project. It's a substantial restoration and we -- we try to work very

delicately with the HPRB and the Board and the community to get something that works for everybody.

We think we've done that. We tried most recently to respond to OP's most recent submission on Friday with a compromise. We think we've done that. We've had favorable response from Office of Planning. They need a written submission and we're going to forward that to them so they can make a final decision.

But, as we sit here today, we have a project that we think if really nice. It is financeable. It is buildable if it's approved the way we've submitted with the exception of splitting the third floor which we intend to do and we can go forward. We have a lender that will step up and go and this can get done. This building's been sitting a long time and we're excited about it.

It's not a get rich project. It's very small. You guys have seen the project and the submissions, but it's a great project. It'll have ten residential units in it that are reasonably affordable for that area. It'll have some really nice two-story walkup with an elevator funky office space that we actually occupy on 7th Street and like it very much and it'll have some great retail. Right across from

the Convention Center, but yet in a residential community which makes it a little bit trickier. So, it's kind of got the best of all the worlds just little bits of it.

Exorbitant. We have to pin the facades in total. Do a complete structure to hold the facades up. Do a lot just to stabilize them when we build the rear of the site out. The mortar joints as I said are dust. The windows have to be replaced. Each joist has to be taken out, replaced with a joist in kind, joist by joist. It's a hand-pick job and that drives the construction expenses up and Mr. Robinson can testify to those in detail if you -- if you'd like.

But, you know, these are the facts. They just -- it has to work at the end of the day and we think what we've put forward hopefully works for everybody as well as this Board because we'd like to go forward. It's a great project.

And that's really where I am.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Thank you very much.

The replacement in kind of the interior structure, is that something that's required?

MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: By the Historic
2	Preservation?
3	MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes, this is not a
4	facadomy. We are going to restore. These structures
5	are going to be restored with similar materials and
6	placement in kind in total.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: These are actually
8	designated structures then not contributing?
9	MR. MILLSTEIN: They are contributing to
10	the historic district.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And so, the Historic
12	Preservation Board though has stepped inside the
13	building to regulate the elements of the interior of
14	the building?
15	MR. MILLSTEIN: Well, we we have we
16	have agreed to do that as part of the restoration of
17	the building.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that.
19	Yes, I'm just asking if that's actually what they've
20	done.
21	MR. MILLSTEIN: Well, when we went to the
22	Board, they Ms. Eig Ms. Eig can answer that
23	question. That's one of the reasons why we have so
24	many experts.
25	MS. EIG: What the situation is is that

1	when buildings are designated as or properties are
2	designated as landmarks where there are contributing
3	buildings, it is not as is commonly popularly known as
4	an exterior designate. There is no such thing.
5	Properties are designated. Buildings are
6	included in that. We only monitor the exterior work,
7	but we also monitor the structural work. So, if you
8	think of a building as a structure, walls around the
9	structure and then the finishes of the interior, it is
10	only the finishes of the interior that are not
11	monitored.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, these have been
13	registered as contributing structures or these are
14	actually designated
15	MS. EIG: They're contributing structures,
16	but it is
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: historic
18	buildings?
19	MS. EIG: They are contributing structures
20	to the historic district, but no building can have
21	demolition of parts of its of its structure
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that.
23	MS. EIG: without permission of the
24	review board.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, what you're

1	saying
2	MS. EIG: And this is the case where the
3	structure of these buildings are in such bad condition
4	that they have to be taken out and replaced. To do so
5	by just gutting the building would constitute
6	demolition and it is not the intention of anyone to
7	demolish these buildings. It's rather to repair ir
8	kind.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's your if
10	if the entire shells of these buildings and the
11	exterior, the facades, were maintained, but the
12	interior was reconfigured or removed, that would be a
13	demolition?
14	MS. EIG: The floors of these if all
15	the floors of these buildings would be removed, it
16	would constitute a demotion by our code. Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Interesting. Okay.
18	MR. MILLSTEIN: We're going to, in fact,
19	maintain that the different floor levels
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
21	MR. MILLSTEIN: between building to
22	building
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that.
24	MS. EIG: And so and it's more. It's
25	that the the staff is well aware Mr. Callcott is

well aware of the level of the condition of these building and --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MS. EIG: -- the effort that is to be made 5 to make sure that we don't get into a demolition --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not questioning 6 that. I'm --8 MS. EIG: -- issue. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's probably why 10 I don't sit on the HPRB. But, I don't agree with that 11 designation or the jurisdiction to go in, but any --12 MS. EIG: Well, they're not --13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let's move on. 14 MS. EIG: You have to realize -- but, you 15 should understand that it's not that they're saying 16 that they're going to monitor this in a different way 17 that they monitor any building. Anyone who would come 18 up and want to remove entire floors, the structural 19 system. We're not talking about the -- the oak --20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. We -we 21 won't argue that here. 22 MS. EIG: -- wood that might be on it. 23 We're talking about the structure. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I can -- I'm aware 25 of court cases that would disagree with you on that,

but let's -- let's move on. MS. EIG: Okay. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Because that's -the case in point for us today is yes, you're going to 5 get a couple of big guys out there and change these joists and put them back in. That being said -- and 6 -- and actually, that's one of the uniquenesses of --8 of this application, the submission, is the different 9 floor levels. 10 You went through quickly. I think you 11 said you occupy office buildings like this. 12 MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You were saying it's 14 funky office. What does that actually mean? 15 MR. MILLSTEIN: Well, I don't know that there's a true definition for funky other than my own. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, let's check 18 the regulations. 19 MR. MILLSTEIN: I think that's a safe bet. 20 It's not 21st and K. It's not eight-foot ceilings 21 and contiguous floors and windows on two or three or 22 four sides if you happen to be that lucky. 23 It's -- it's -- it's some exposed brick. It's wood floor systems instead of concrete and steel. 24 25 Wood floor systems -- floor system. Excuse me.

differing elevations and then accommodating the ADA 2 issues associated with that. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, it's different floor levels. So, you could walk across one --5 MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- one office. 6 I mean like this room has one floor level. These all 8 have different floor levels. 9 MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes, and step down and 10 step up --11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 12 MR. MILLSTEIN: -- in other areas which 13 again we -- we think is an amenity to someone who likes that corky, boutiquy, funky. Find a definition 14 15 for any of the three. You know, if they want to go 21st and K, 16 17 that's a different project. 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 19 MR. MILLSTEIN: But, that's what this 20 project is. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which actually goes 22 to one of the uniqueness then, the practical 23 difficulty in the rear yard, but what you're here for and that is moving the core back because you had 24 25 mentioned briefly in the written submission or maybe I

1	didn't focus enough on it, but the the fact that
2	you just brought up ADA.
3	MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's obviously the
5	transitions that would be required to get
6	MR. MILLSTEIN: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: handicapped
8	persons through.
9	MR. MILLSTEIN: Correct.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Require that the
11	the elevator be in the new portion which would set it
12	at
13	MR. MILLSTEIN: Right.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: the single
15	levels.
16	MR. MILLSTEIN: That's right.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. All right.
18	Let's proceed.
19	MR. GLASGOW: Are there any further
20	questions for Mr. Millstein? Hearing none, we'll now
21	proceed to the testimony of Mr. Robinson.
22	Could you discuss the complexity the
23	construction complexities and costs with respect to
24	this project?
25	MR. ROBINSON: As as Mr. Millstein has
J	

previously pointed out, the complexities of -shoring and maintaining the facades and building the interior structures are adding a great deal of cost to the -- to the baseline of the project.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is shoring?

MR. ROBINSON: Shoring is a term for supporting either a floor or a wall and footing We have found condition of these buildings. similar structures as in 800 F Street and the 900 series F Street buildings that we have to go in and literally undermine the existing footings and then -then underpin them and then build a framework up both sides of the -- the facades to hold the facade in place while we do work inside the -- the existing building.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is that clear? So, you're like building another structure around these buildings to hold them up while you do the work?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got --

MR. ROBINSON: You're literally building a structure front and back of the existing facade. Often penetrating the interior floors to set it up and then you -- you renovate the -- the facade, hold it in place, repair the existing structure inside of the

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

facade.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. ROBINSON: And then remove the shoring at a later date.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Can I just a -- is it -- that's a fairly common practice when you're renovating historic buildings?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, ma'am, especially masonry-style buildings like this. It's -- it's a little bit simpler process when the buildings are made of wood, wood structures because you can -- you can insert wood where the wood has -- has given way or has been degraded. But, in this -- in the cases like this, you can't allow the structure to move or your masonry will crack and you'll start experiencing other problems that you'll have to repair. So, literally brace it with steel on the front and back sides.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, you're anticipating the potential of the masonry, the facade's moving because you have the -- the unique situation that you have to remove all that interior and you have to replace it in kind. Is that correct?

MR. ROBINSON: That's correct. Right now

NEAL R. GROSS

the condition of the building as we have looked at them is -- is that there's going to be a lot of work on the interior to -- to repair the floor structure and the floor systems --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. -- to get them back to MR. ROBINSON: their condition. MR. MILLSTEIN: And -- and again, it would be typical in many historic restorations to do a facade pinning, but now with the amount of interior construction that would normally be in place. 12 buildings remain. So, when the interior of the 13 buildings typically remain, you would not have to pin the 14 facades. You could simply build the 15 construction to the rear. But, since the -- the guts are coming out, you have to pin the facade. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You just said two 18 things. There is some uniqueness to this. It is not 19 necessarily typical of the --MR. MILLSTEIN: No. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- of the extent of 22 what you have to do. 23 MILLSTEIN: Correct. MR. Because typically if you -- if you -- if you're not doing a 24

facadomy and you're leaving the buildings in place,

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

20

21

1	the buildings themselves would hold the facade in
2	place.
3	But, in this particular project, you're
4	actually doing a joist-by-joist replacement of the
5	interior which subjects the front wall to weakness and
6	potential failure.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, you're
8	saying that the floors obviously are structural. They
9	hold up the walls and they hold the diaphragm of the
10	building so it doesn't cave in on itself.
11	MR. MILLSTEIN: That's correct. That's
12	right.
13	MR. ROBINSON: In addition to
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Did you have an
15	expert structural engineer today?
16	MR. MILLSTEIN: I did oh, not today.
17	I'm sorry.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm just kidding.
19	Come on. Let's move on.
20	MR. ROBINSON: In addition to maintaining
21	the facades and holding them in place, to be able to
22	take the interior structure out, we will probably have
23	to underpin any of the return walls that come off of
24	the facades.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What does that mean

underpin?

MR. ROBINSON: Underpin means literally to go in and dig out from under the wall to excavate underneath the footing and then to -- to either fill back a concrete pit to support that footing or insert a steel pile called a bracket pile to carry the load of that wall so that it doesn't move and give way.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, you have to hold up the facades that are obviously hanging out there and you have to support the -- the foundation of this building also.

MR. ROBINSON: That's correct and -- and especially if we have an elevation change in the basement level to excavate for modern utilities or drainage lines, storm systems, that -- that sort of thing. Then it would require that we would undermine and underpin these footings to keep them in place.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And as stated -- Mr. Millstein pointed out the fact that these were almost on the block to be razed by the city which is a whole other procedure we could question, but that's out of our jurisdiction.

So, just the structural integrity as they are now is in question.

MR. ROBINSON: That is correct. It's

NEAL R. GROSS

going to take a lot of work to put them back to where they will be --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. ROBINSON: -- a safe structure. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And that's -- and 6 that's -- okay. Well, it goes without saying that's not typical of all contributing buildings that they're all 8 9 falling apart or the backs of which. We have 10 photographs that the backs of these are gone or some 11 of them all actually not there. 12 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. All right. 14 Let's move ahead. 15 MR. ROBINSON: I apologize if it was 16 misleading to say it was typical of all buildings. It's typical for this type of building and -- and the 17 800 F Street and the 900 series F Street that we were 18 19 comparing it to. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 21 MR. ROBINSON: That -- that's what I was 22 referring to. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. 24 MR. ROBINSON: The -- in addition to this, 25 we will have to open the backs of the buildings to --

to bring the slabs of the new structure that's
proposed here into them and and support the
those openings. Then we have the new construction
behind this which has to be isolated from their
buildings that will go into the ground, the footings
that will be be set for the new building and then
we will tie the two structures together as they go up
and then tie the roof lines in at the different levels
where we have roofs and all this is contributing
somewhat to the to the cost of the project.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is the addition also
wood frame or is it steel?
MR. ROBINSON: The addition is is steel
and concrete and fill
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Okay. Okay.
What else?
MR. ROBINSON: Then then we have
then you basically have the the new office I'm
sorry, the new building that's constructed behind with
the new amenities, the HVA systems and then the
finishes of the ten apartments that are scheduled to
go into the into the structure as they're currently
drawn.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Any

questions?

1	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Robinson, did you you
2	did a breakdown of the the cost per square foot of
3	construction on this project?
4	MR. ROBINSON: Yes, sir.
5	MR. GLASGOW: What was that number?
6	MR. ROBINSON: It was around \$275 per
7	square foot.
8	MR. GLASGOW: And is that an extremely
9	high construction cost for a for one of these types
10	of projects?
11	MR. ROBINSON: For one of these types of
12	projects, no, it's very similar to the ones that we
13	we defined at the beginning of this this 800 F
14	Street.
15	MR. GLASGOW: I thought that those
16	projects were at about \$190 a foot?
17	MR. ROBINSON: They were at a \$190 a
18	square foot except a lot of them did not involve the
19	the intensive shoring that these buildings are
20	going to have.
21	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
22	MR. ROBINSON: Some did. Some did not.
23	MR. GLASGOW: So, the total cost of this
24	project at 275 versus 190 is this this project
25	is unique and has a higher cost from that standpoint.

1	MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.
2	MR. GLASGOW: All right.
3	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm just looking to
4	find the page on which the incremental costs that you
5	identified that's associated with the I just want
6	to be clear \$1,650,000. Is that the incremental cost
7	associated with all things related to preserving the
8	structures or the atypical?
9	This was this would be on page six of
10	the statement of the Applicant.
11	MR. GLASGOW: Are you referring to the
12	line that calls out a construction and design
13	contingency on historic? Which
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Are you looking at
15	Exhibit K? Are you looking at a chart? Okay.
16	MR. GLASGOW: Exhibit K. Yes, ma'am.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What what she's
18	referring just to make sure. It's page six. The
19	last sentence in that paragraph reads "For the project
20	these exceptional preservation related contingencies
21	add more than \$1,650,000."
22	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. So so, we are
23	looking at the contingency line item for the historic
24	and the design and the the construction and and
25	what we're saying here is that is really unforeseen.

could include the underpinning that referring to, the additional shoring that may take 2 3 place depending upon how extensively damaged interior structure is. So --5 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. So, the 6 1,650,000 is relative to what would be a typical historic restoration project relative or 8 nonhistoric project? 9 MR. GLASGOW: It -- it would not be -- it 10 would not be relative to --11 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: What's it relative 12 to? 13 MR. GLASGOW: What it's relative to is the condition of the existing structure and not being able 14 15 to tell to what degree the repairs will be required in the structure. 16 To say that it's typical of any other 17 18 structure just because it's historic or nonhistoric, 19 it's very difficult to define it in that means. Ιf 20 you -- if you see the inside of this building, it's -there's a lot of unknowns here that we have to put 21 22 into a contingency basis. 23 Is it typical to 800 F Street and to some of the buildings on the 900 F Street areas that we've 24

taken apart, there are some similarities. But, to say

it's typical of all historic renovations, I'm not sure that's -- that's something that we can say. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, your point is there are specific -- site specific aspects that you're anticipating which --MR. GLASGOW: That's correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There are unique aspects in these structures. The point is altogether that you're anticipating will be more costly. MR. GLASGOW: That -- that's -- that's correct and I -- and I can't say that this cost per se is typical to every historic. Because it may not be. MR. MILLSTEIN: If I may, I can clearly say that this is very atypical in the fact that I don't know of any development in the last ten years that I've seen in this area that would take on this amount of restoration in such a small footprint. building approximately nets out 40,000 square feet. That is a small project. I don't -- you know, I'm not aware of anyone that had to do this level of restoration and repair just to gain a 40,000 foot project and that's what makes it very atypical. 800 F Street, the Spy

Museum, we had a 74,000 square foot office building

behind it. So, made all that restoration a little

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

more stomachable and made the numbers not so great.

Which driving this number of the 270 a foot is that you don't have the massive new construction to balance it out. It's a very limited amount of new construction. So, the numbers are way out of whack and that's what happens and that's what's atypical about this particular project, the size.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. I'm just trying to sort out -- I just want to sort out two things now since you mentioned -- do you feel that HPRB is being in anyway -- what you -- one of the things that you just said was you don't know of any other developer who would undertake this level of renovation on a project of this size. So, is that because HPRB doesn't typically require it or it's just a coincidence that in this particular -- or it's just a circumstance of this particular case that there is no opportunity for offsetting new construction?

MR. MILLSTEIN: Candidly, Ms. Mitten, I -I find that HPRB has a changing degree of requirements
every time I go before them. Nothing seems to be
consistent.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. MILLSTEIN: And no matter what project I take before them, it's the most significant historic

projects in the city. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. MR. MILLSTEIN: Held to a whole other level of scrutiny. I think the setbacks are insane on 5 this project. I think the level of restoration is out of line, but we could have a whole another discussion 6 about the HPRB process. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why don't we break 9 and have that? No, wait a minute. 10 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I'm just 11 trying to --12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. 13 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- understand. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. So -- okay. I -- I hear what you just said. 16 17 MR. MILLSTEIN: Okay. And 18 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: then, Mr. 19 Robinson, what I'm trying to sort out is there's an 20 argument being made -- I mean this is ultimately the 21 argument I think for the additional density that there are -- that there are unusual circumstances that sort 22 23 is typical for of rise above what historic а restoration project because of the very unusual 24

circumstances here with deterioration, the size of the

site, the amount of restoration that's being required, and so forth and so, it's -- and it's that increment that I believe if there's any argument -- if there's -- if there is a legitimate economic argument to be made that it's against that increment not against the total.

So, that's why I'm -- I'm trying to be real precise about what the 1,650,000 represents.

MR. ROBINSON: I understand your question and it's not an easy question to answer, but by using the words typical -- because as Mr. Millstein has pointed out, every time he goes before the -- the Board for review, they talk about typical projects. It's not.

If we go back and look at the projects that have been talked about to date, the 900 F Street projects are just a single facade held up by a steel structure. They will then be tied into a new concrete structure and there's very little renovation cost because they were saved in their entirety except for the windows. So, the windows will be matched to historic styles.

The 800 F Street, you had three buildings that -- that needed very little interior renovation. You had two that had to be completely dismantled brick

by brick and then reassembled with the same brick using similar mortars. That kept the cost of 74,000 square foot addition somewhat lower than this one.

This one we're assuming we're going to go in and we're going to shore all the facades up. We're going to completely dismantle the interior structure and once we dismantle that interior structure, we're not sure if we can put it back together the way it was put together a hundred years ago. We may have to use some modern systems to hold it back together, but it's going to be up to whether the Historic Board is going to approve some of these -- these reconstruction methods. But, we will try to use everything we can there.

This line item of a million six is a contingency because we don't know exactly what is going to come apart in this building until we've actually taken it apart and see what's inside it. That's why I hesitate to apply the term typical to any of these.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. I guess I got as much of an answer there as I'm going to.

I -- I'd also wanted to ask since I think we're going to get into financial feasibility at some point since Mr. Bolan's here, is how much did you pay

for the properties?

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MILLSTEIN: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: That's a question I'd like to have answered because the financial feasibility turns on that to some extent.

MR. MILLSTEIN: Okay. I can get -- I can get that.

And, Ms. Mitten, if I may, I think focusing on the 1.6 as the -- as the delta is not the right way to look at this.

I think focusing on the 270 a foot is the right answer.

You could take that million six off. The numbers are still way out of kilter. The million six is a simple contingency that's on any project. Even a new construction project. Although a contingency may be -- it would be smaller in retrospect, but it's a contingency. It's just a larger contingency line item that a lender would typically see on -- on a construction project because of its historic nature.

I think the real issue here is the overall cost of the project and the cost per square foot and that's based -- that's all of these line items getting -- getting elevated proportionately by the nature of the structure.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I take your point 2 and I'm -- I'm just going to tell you what I'm 3 thinking --MR. MILLSTEIN: Okay. 5 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- which is you have -- there's a uniqueness standard for a variance --6 MR. MILLSTEIN: Right. 8 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- test. We have 9 lots of historic properties in this city and they're 10 required to be preserved, restored and they don't all 11 come here and make a financial feasibility argument to 12 get a variance. This is somehow different than that. 13 So, I'm trying to focus on what makes this different. 14 So, if you want to change -- if you want 15 to -- if you want to come up with a different number 16 says well, that's just -- that's just 17 contingency number, there's actually other numbers that are built into the rest of the estimate that our 18 19 -- that do reflect unique circumstances, I'd be 20 interested in knowing what those were. Because that's 21 what -- that's what -- that's what's making you 22 unique. 23 MR. MILLSTEIN: Sure. 24 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So, I'm just trying

to sort that out.

MR. MILLSTEIN: We can do that. We can do 2 that very easily. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. MILLSTEIN: Just based past 5 projects that are completed and the cost that they --I know what 7th Street ran a foot. I know what 800 F 6 Street ran a foot. I know what those projects ran a 8 foot. I signed every check. So, I --9 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. When you --10 when you give us those numbers, please focus on -- you 11 know, I mean if you do the -- if you -- if you have a 12 building that you have new construction behind and you 13 stuck a preservation project in the front and then you 14 give us the average over the project, you're not 15 really showing us what the incremental costs for the 16 historic structures was. So, please don't dilute the 17 number --18 MR. MILLSTEIN: Okay. 19 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- when you give it 20 Do you follow me? to us. 21 MR. MILLSTEIN: Well -- yes, but I -- I 22 thought what you were most interested in are the 23 project overall costs of the because they're 24 intertwined, both the construction new and the

historic. So, it's the cost to develop the project

and the mix of historic and new is just the nature of the beast. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. Okay. MR. MILLSTEIN: So, I'll price similar 5 things. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions? 8 MR. GLASGOW: All right. I'd like to call 9 the next witness Ms. Emily Eig. 10 Would you please identify yourself for the 11 record and proceed with your testimony? 12 MS. EIG: My name is Emily Hotaling Eig 13 and I'm an architectural historian and preservation consultant with the HT Traceries. 14 15 testimony seeks to direct your attention to the history of the building both past and 16 present and their contribution to the Shaw Historic 17 18 District and I think perhaps that will help answer Ms. 19 Mitten's question about their uniqueness. 20 The five buildings are located on the 21 southwest corner of Square 399 and there is a map up 22 I will get up and point this out. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, actually what we can do is -- why don't we move those closer so that 24 25 they're next to the table and then actually we can see

the

them. Perhaps, Melissa, you could MS. EIG: 3 point out the site for me and be my Vanna White. This is the N Street here. MS. COHEN: 5 Convention --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually, I'm going to need to have you on a microphone is you say 8 anything. You can pick that one up and carry it over 9 I believe. 10 MS. COHEN: North -- north is running this 11 way. I'm sorry for the confusion. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. MS. COHEN: But, this is 9th Street. 13 14 Street. Our project's right here on 15 northeast corner. Convention Center is right here. 16 There is a -- a public alley right behind our site, a vacant lot and then 8th Street. 17 The five buildings that form 18 MS. EIG: 19 these -- this group were built at different times. 20 The -- actually the square was subdivided in the 1850s 21 as you'll find most of the -- the property that is 22 north of Massachusetts Avenue and as we get into the 23 Shaw and Mt. Vernon Historic Districts. And the -- there were buildings built on 24

the five lots in the 1860s. Of these, some of these

1	remain and the corner the large corner building was
2	replaced in 1891 with this large orange brick building
3	that is at the corner.
4	The smaller buildings were built either
5	individually. There is one pair say they are from the
6	1860s. They were built during the Civil War actually,
7	1860 to 1866, a little bit after.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Now, your report
9	says that corner building that you're talking and
10	you've described it I guess it's your description.
11	There's probably documents.
12	MS. EIG: Yes. Yes, that's
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Italianate which is
14	we'll call it Italianate Light perhaps.
15	MS. EIG: Exactly.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, that was built
17	for a single family. Correct?
18	MS. EIG: With a
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: With retail on the
20	first floor.
21	MS. EIG: with a store on the first
22	floor.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Fascinating
24	stuff.
25	MS. EIG: Yes. Yes.
	1

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, it was a mixeduse building. 2 Right. And by the 1890s, MS. EIG: downtown there were actually many buildings that were 5 built to the south this that were the same thing --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. MS. EIG: -- of the -- of store at the first floor with a large and gracious house above. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 10 MS. EIG: Which is not your typical idea 11 of a little residence upstairs, but --12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 13 MS. EIG: -- more grand. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Kind of a great 15 urban concept. 16 Yes, the -- actually, Douglas MS. EIG: 17 Development's offices are at 7th and H which is 18 Fuddruckers. You may know downtown and that was the 19 Herman family owned. I mean my office was in there in 20 the 19 -- 1989 through '91 and it was a three-story. 21 You know, it was a very, very large grand house that 22 had been converted over the years, but they ran their 23 furniture store from the first floor. It was actually a clothing store from the first floor. 24

So, that is an interesting fact that also

shows the change in that neighborhood. Because the other buildings which were from the 1860s are more modest. They are all wood frame with masonry walls and they're -- they're wood frame structures. Floor systems are all together and the condition of them is extremely poor.

As Mr. Millstein testified, it was in the summer of 2002 that the -- there were these rains that had caused damage and they were very damaging to this site. Particularly the rear of these abandoned buildings were failing terribly. We brought Steve Callcott out to the site. We had -- Clark Ray was there. The -- every effort was being made to maintain these buildings and not to raze them.

The -- certainly Steve Callcott in the Preservation Office did not want them to be demolished, but they were in extremely poor condition and they allowed us to removed some of the completely deteriorated rear sections of the building which is why they are open as they are -- they've been stabilized, but you can see that they've -- parts of them have been removed and that was in order to stabilize the buildings and keep the rest intact.

The condition of these is the product of the deteriorated state of the neighborhood that is in

that area which is improving we hope with the convention center and there are many buildings that don't come here. For one reason, they're not in C2A zones. They are in residential zones and people might come in and choose to do less excessive structure that is necessary for commercial purposes to meet the C2A zoning.

The situation of these buildings is that because they are sided right next to the Convention Center they're -- and they are between a gas station and the Convention Center. There's an Amoco station I believe to the north.

Also, that they are on a corner. The 1891 building has essentially two faces, two facades for public exposure and there were two small apartment flat buildings that are -- were in the rear yard that are -- that were torn down sometime between 1964 and 1980. I'm sorry. I don't have the exact date when they were razed, but they show up on the maps as flats. They were very small buildings that essentially sat in the rear yard of that corner 1301.

The efforts that have been made to stabilize these buildings until a plan for action could take place has required effort on the part of Douglas Development to just keep them there. They --

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the buildings are in an area that still suffers from untoward behavior. Certainly things are improving, but it is -- these buildings -- any building that is abandoned or not being used on a regular basis is certainly susceptible to that kind of activity and they are -- because of their corner location, their location across from the Convention Center, I think there are a lot of people watching this and hoping that there will be a very good project here.

The Convention Center is now open. I think many of us are very happy with how it's turned out and didn't quite expect it to be as favorably end result as we have achieved there and with the City Museum there, it's a very big focus and very exciting.

My office is at 5th and New York. So, I am right down there everyday.

And the -- this -- if you haven't been down there, you may have been to the front of the Convention Center, but if you've been to the side, all you will see is vacant buildings surrounding it. There is very little use here and there there is some use especially along 7th Street. There a few of the buildings have some occupants, but they are either for lease or no one's paying attention to them and we'll all waiting for that great boom of activity that the

press tells us is going to happen around the Convention Center and I cannot get a cup of coffee around my office. Let's be honest.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

MS. EIG: The need for there to be a project that would actually take on these very expensive buildings and to improve them will be I think well received by everyone in the -- that neighborhood and the Advisory Neighborhood Commission, the Shaw Historic District and the effort is -- that is being presented here is one to obviously to compliment the historic character of the buildings.

The visits to the Review Board originally requested larger а much new structure, new construction. The Review Board was adamant that any new construction be pushed to the off -- I should say off the historic buildings because of the corner They -- the typical building in the back location. and coming forward was not approved by them because they felt it was too visible because of the two exposures from both N and 9th Street. The -- as well as the public alley that is behind them, actually parallel to 9th Street, makes it visible from the rear as well because right now there is a vacant lot and an alley between the church that is on 8th Street and the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

building on 9th.

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Seems to be a temporary condition or --

MS. EIG: One would hope so.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- not?

MS. EIG: One would hope so. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. EIG: The restoration of the facades, their stabilization, the repairs due to the partial collapse at the rear, and the salvage of the fabric so that it can be restored while in some cases are representative of what one faces when dealing with historic buildings, in this case everyone of them is necessary and they're all to the extreme because of the level of neglect prior to the purchase by Douglas Development.

The Review Board wanted both elevations to be articulated in the manner that the corner building had been in that they would both be visible because the -- actually the N Street which is the side of that group of buildings is what faces the Convention Center and they were very interested in that appearing appropriate to the new Convention Center site.

The connections between the new and old can and must be as -- with as little damage to the

fabric of the interior of the buildings. The floors are at different heights. There are different deterioration stages and you will see when the architect speaks, you know, how she's tried to minimize the impact of the floor changes.

The existing floor -- the window configurations also are all different because these were built with the exception of one pair at different -- you know, by different owners with no concern for their neighbor per se and clearly to meet modern -- modern building codes that are in place -- that have to be imposed on this including -- because of the C2A. I assume in the uses that would be here for retail, mechanical, trash rooms, and things.

And the -- using a building in mixed use, we see downtown, but we don't see residential. We see -- might see office and retail. We haven't see much retail in residential except in new buildings. It comes every once in a while, but it's -- coming up here, historically, this is what had been here. But, we're not seeing it new that much and it's starting to come again and it's very exciting that people are, you know, happy to live in mixed use buildings again.

So, I see this as a prominent site that is critical to the area's rehabilitation simply because

and we hope that this will be a stimulus to it. 2 It's -- the -- the location across from the Convention Center to me makes this building to 5 some degree a -- a small but still a symbol of D.C.'s 6 potential for the future. Because when people come to the Convention Center and they look around, I would 8 certainly think that one would hope D.C. can do better 9 around the Convention Center and this is an 10 opportunity to show that the Shaw Historic District 11 and Mt. Vernon Historic District both which front onto the Convention Center site --12 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 14 MS. EIG: -- in fact can be rehabilitated 15 and brought back to represent D.C. as a place that cares about it's neighborhood --16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 18 MS. EIG: -- and in fact will be a good 19 future. 20 I don't think you'd CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 21 have any disagreement from this Board that they'd like 22 to see good things happen around the Convention Center 23 and all the neighborhoods in bringing back retail and so, I'll take that and your strong enthusiasm for this 24

there has not been the kinds of projects we hoping for

being a catalyst as going to the -- the test of which

we look at that this would not go against the -- the public good --

MS. EIG: Right.

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- and we'll leave it at that.

Anything else for summary in terms of uniqueness or practical difficulty, the historic -- or how --

I just -- I just say I do as I MS. EIG: think you are aware many, many projects. very small project to deal with as Mr. Millstein stated and has been -- the amount of new construction limited to so little that it's borderline as to whether it could happen. I think that the rear yard relief is part of that -- that issue and the realities of financial -- the cost of these buildings are quite real or otherwise buildings would be done everyday and we'd have a beautiful city if it didn't cost as much as it does.

So, that to the -- you know, provide for the Historic Preservation Review Board's requirements on this site which are in a -- their newer, more stringent desire to move new construction off completely from historic buildings and this was not the case two years ago. It is the case now. They've

made it a policy. They want to see new construction
completely off the new I mean off the historic
buildings. When it's in the rear, begins a cycle
is very difficult to deal with and may make some
projects not possible to proceed when they might have
been possible in the past.
So, with that in mind, I think that the
practical difficulties of trying to deal with the fact
that they were able to make the Review Board and that
this went to the consent calendar in the end was very
positive, but we hope we can actually construct it.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Is that part
of our tests going through HPRB as a practical
difficulty? Okay.
MS. EIG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say
you stated that not me. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's why I get
into so much trouble. All right. What else?
Are we going to walk through
architectural?
MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MR. GLASGOW: That is now.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let's do that and we
can we're going to pick up the pace a little bit

here, but let's get through the -- the plans.

Also, I -- what I'd like you to do is as you walk through the residential units how they're laid out and how the, one, the layout and the square footage relates to what it takes to make a residential unit. Meaning does the size, shape, and location go to the expansion of the FAR in this building and I think you can get through that fairly quickly, but I will add that into what you're about to tell us.

So, please proceed.

MS. COHEN: Okay. Briefly, we talked about this being an expensive project for its size and scope. We're proposing to do a full restoration project. Existing two and three story buildings are significant, but they're -- they're -- as we talked about, need a lot of work. We're stabilizing them. We're unpinning them. We're restoring the existing facades and we're pairing -- restoring the existing facades is quite a bit of work which I'm going to walk through, but it's not only repairing missing and damaged materials in kind, but there are going to be new store fronts designed and based on historical documentation and it'll take quite an effort.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, could you say actually part of the uniqueness what Ms. Eig has also

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

brought up is -- is bringing back the original use of these things. MS. COHEN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean that's 5 something unique of --MS. COHEN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: these 8 particular properties in terms of their retail. 9 MS. COHEN: Yes, that's correct. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MS. COHEN: Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think -- and I 12 13 don't think we need to go into --14 MS. COHEN: That's fine. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- extensive detail. 16 Although clearly this Board would love to have design 17 review on everything. We don't and -- except in 18 particular cases. So, we're not that concerned with 19 -- or we're not able to be concerned with, you know, 20 the specifics. Clearly, you stated -- I mean the --21 the facades need to be repaired and whatever that 22 takes to fenestrate the windows. Obviously, there's a 23 lot of detailing of wood and possibly metal -- metal cornices and bandings. I think that's pretty clear. 24 25 MS. COHEN: Okay. Let's see. Basically,

we've been working with the -- we've been working with 2 the community, working with the Historic Preservation 3 Review Board and trying to -- and the client and trying to make all these difficult I guess motivations 5 come together. things One of the that Historic 6 Preservation Review Board wanted us to do was keep off 8 the existing structure and so let me just start here. 9 Basically, this is the existing structure right here. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: All 11 Actually, I'm going to have the Board look at -- you 12 did some diagrams. 13 MS. COHEN: Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually some three 15 dimensional diagrams that show the setback. 16 about to show a setback. As the record states are 17 anywhere from 34 to 65 feet which seems 18 extensive but go ahead. I think we understand it. 19 So. 20 MS. COHEN: Okay. Okay. So, basically, 21 that's the footprint. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, the massing is 23 moved to the back. I mean that's pretty clear. 24 MS. COHEN: All is the back and the rear. 25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

	MS. COREN: And that's to have unfilluar
2	impact visible impact on N Street and 9th Street.
3	These are some of the elevations. This is
4	restoring the the existing structures over here and
5	then our new buildings would be more modern and
6	setback.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What's the facade
8	material on the addition?
9	MS. COHEN: On the addition? Well, on the
10	addition, it would be brick. It would be matching the
11	same materials.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. On the
13	street front.
14	MS. COHEN: On the street front. So, we'd
15	match the same scale materials, proportions, et cetera
16	and keep that that solid street front street-
17	scape going and then the back would be more modern and
18	we're still working out the materials, but probably
19	some kind of ceramic panel or something. Flat panel.
20	Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Should we pick the
22	material right now while we have a moment?
23	MS. COHEN: Basically, I'll walk through
24	the floor plans really quickly.
25	Basement, we are staying off the historic

structures altogether. So, the basement, all the new work is right back in here and all of the services occur there. The -- the egress is the elevator. The machine rooms, mechanical, electrical, all of that stuff will happen in the new -- new part of the building.

The first floor -- the first floor, the intent also all of the services stay at the rear of the building and retail the first floor in the -- in the front. This will be the lobby to take you up to the office floors and to the residential units.

Third floor, we just -- I skipped a floor.

The second floor we talked about as being office space. Basically, the same footprint all the way up and all the services are in the rear of the building.

The third floor is the one that we just revised based on the report and it's a little hard to see here, but the third floor, basically apartments are laid out. So, the apartments are in this part. There's one here, one here, one here, and a small one over here. So, this is 872 square feet of building -- of a -- of apartment, 1150, 475, and 600 roughly.

The -- the -- one of the difficulties in this project is this right here is we're on the property. This is a property line over here. This is

1	our street-scape obviously. So, 9th and N Street, we
2	have plenty of windows. That's fine. But, the
3	problem comes along this wall when you can't have any
4	windows along the property line because someone might
5	build a a unit right there or build anything up
6	there.
7	Along the alley wall, we'll have to make
8	some concessions about how to deal with the fire
9	rating, but the same. We'll have we'll be able to
10	have some windows there with as long as it's
11	protected.
12	So, the apartments basically only exposed
13	on three sides. So, I'm kind of working around it.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't understand
15	the plan the revised third floor. Show me 9th
16	Street. 9th Street's on the bottom, correct, of the
17	drawing.
18	MS. COHEN: Yes. Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. That's fine
20	and your units stop doesn't the existing structure
21	go up to the third floor?
22	MS. COHEN: I'm sorry.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Does the existing
24	structure go up to the third level?

MS. COHEN: It does. The third -- third

level -- this building is only two stories. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. This building three. MS. COHEN: These are three. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, your unit seems to stop much further back. 6 MS. COHEN: Our unit's all the back. 8 the new -- the new part is -- is back in here. 9 But, on the third CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 10 floor what you're looking at in the plan, it goes all 11 the way to the edge. 12 MS. COHEN: Coming up. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, okay. That 14 makes more sense to me now. All right. 15 What I was looking at in the drawing that you're showing, it's -- it appears to me -- I may not 16 17 be looking at this right, but there -- there's 18 portions that are possibly shaded a little bit and it 19 looked like the units were stopping before they 20 reached 9th Street which is part of the existing 21 So, I just wanted to know what was structure. 22 happening in between that. 23 So, that's -- yes. 24 MS. COHEN: Yes. 25 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, you've shaded

1	the residential.
2	MS. COHEN: Actually, it doesn't. The
3	the shading is just what's what's new.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I'm what
5	you've just drawn on the drawing is what
6	MS. COHEN: Right. Right. What I just
7	showed is
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Right.
9	Right.
10	MS. COHEN: is
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Got ya.
12	MS. COHEN: I know. If you look here
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Now, we're clear.
14	MS. COHEN: the existing building.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
16	MS. COHEN: Three stories, two, three,
17	three.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
19	MS. COHEN: So, we're and then stepping
20	and then we're stepping back 30 to 60 feet back for
21	the new new parts of the building.
22	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Could you hold that
23	up to your mouth more?
24	MS. COHEN: Okay. Fourth floor
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is she reading off

1	82
1	that mike? Okay.
2	MS. COHEN: Okay. Fourth floor
3	departments are laid out. Here we have six
4	apartments. Five of them will be two stories.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
6	MS. COHEN: This one's a single story and
7	that's because on N Street we wanted to keep the
8	scale.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
10	MS. COHEN: And try to keep the building
11	as as low as possible. So, these are two story
12	units that take us up to the
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And the
14	the roughly the square footages of the units for
15	the the two levels?
16	MS. COHEN: The two levels are 1300.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
18	MS. COHEN: 1300, 820, 800, 960, 800.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And there's a
20	diversity of of unit types. Is that correct or
21	not? All they all five bedroom.
22	MS. COHEN: There there five
23	duplexes and they're one to two bedrooms depending
24	on
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: One to two, but
1	

that's -- that's -- right. So, that's the --MS. COHEN: The maximum. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. It would be difficult to get MS. COHEN: 5 two in there, but -- on the fifth floor, we have the duplex units and also 6 floors of the recreation space. It would be the roof terrace. 8 would be facing the Convention Center on N Street. 9 Take advantage of that spot. 10 Because of the -- we're pretty much trying 11 to fill in the whole lot. There's no other place for 12 -- for recreational space except on this roof terrace. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 14 MS. COHEN: And that's where we are. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Now, there's been some discussion or substantial evidence shown that --16 that the floors are being replaced in the -- of this 17 18 building. Are the interior walls also being 19 maintained? 20 MS. COHEN: The interior walls are -- the 21 masonry bearing walls will be maintained as best they 22 If they're there, they will be maintained, but 23 the interior -- interior walls that are just wood will not be maintained. There is not a whole lot of 24 25 interior partitions.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, on the first
2	floor, would the anticipation is potentially to get
3	several different retailers in there?
4	MS. COHEN: Possibly.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
6	MS. COHEN: Up to whatever they can.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean with the
8	openings and the demolition of
9	MS. COHEN: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: the existing
11	interior
12	MS. COHEN: It would
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: the the
14	potential is you could have a single tenant.
15	MS. COHEN: Exactly. You could have a
16	single tenant
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
18	MS. COHEN: as well.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Interesting. All
20	right.
21	MS. COHEN: We talked about we also
22	looked at the 15 rear the 15 foot
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is there any
24	availability I'm sorry to interrupt you, but we're
25	going to get through this fairly quickly. Is there
1	

1	was there discussion about making a roof terrace off
2	of 9th Street? Bringing a nice guardrail up to the
3	edge of those building and actually terracing the rest
4	of that space?
5	MS. COHEN: We didn't look at that because
6	the Historic Preservation Review Board was trying to
7	keep us off of the off of 9th Street.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, it's your
9	anticipation that HPRB would not have allowed you to
10	do that?
11	MS. COHEN: That was that was my
12	understanding, but
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
14	MS. COHEN: that would be
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It's a nice place
16	for a roof deck. Don't you think?
17	MS. COHEN: It would be nice.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
19	MS. COHEN: The last thing was about the
20	15-foot rear yard setback, the variance and and we
21	talked about that and basically, all of our services
22	are in the back back corner.
23	Part of the reason for that is is
24	because of the different floor heights we already
25	talked about and also we're trying to align the floors

with this corner building 1301 since that's the most structurally sound building, but it also is kind of the average height -- floor heights. So, we aligned the floors with -- we aligned the new construction with a -- with 1301 -
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.

MS. COHEN: -- 9th Street.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Because it kind of splits the difference between the different floor levels. What's the difficulty in having an elevator stop at different floor levels in between floors?

MS. COHEN: Well, it would be -- it would be very difficult because the -- the difference in floor height is about two feet.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.

MS. COHEN: So, I'm not quite sure how you would do it.

These -- this building here -- this building and these two buildings are actually very, very close in floor elevation heights within four or eight inches. So, we were able to ramp and -- and accommodate the differences there.

These two buildings here are quite a bit significantly different and they're about 30 inches. So, it would be difficult to unless -- if you core in

the center, you'd basically have to have two different stops. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MS. COHEN: Like front and back and I mean 5 it's possible, but it would be --6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, it would actually take different doors on the elevator. 8 MS. COHEN: Right. Right. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, would you 10 actually have four doors on the elevator. 11 MS. COHEN: It would -- it would be a 12 little confusing. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And interesting. 14 That's what they have in the Spy Museum. Don't Okay. 15 they? They have like these secret doors or -- all Let's -- any questions for the architect? 16 right. 17 Does everyone understand the design? Understand the 18 problems? Okay. 19 Thank you very much. We appreciate it. 20 In response to an earlier MR. GLASGOW: 21 question today, I wanted to -- to make sure that we had some clarification on Mr. Robinson's testimony and 22 23 I think he is -- he is going back through the numbers so that we can just get a number that is the -- the 24

premium associated with respect to this project.

1	If he could come up. Mr. Robinson.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
3	MR. GLASGOW: Would you please address the
4	the premium associated with this particular project
5	with respect to the historic preservation costs?
6	MR. ROBINSON: I think the original
7	question came from Ms. Mitten as to about how the
8	premium for this project versus other projects and we
9	have come up with about a \$2.8 million premium over
10	the existing structures to repair and renovate them
11	and get them into a stable condition to be able to
12	start the work.
13	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. I'm just
14	going to ask again just to be sure I understand and
15	that's that cost is what is atypical for this
16	historic project or that is all of the the costs
17	related to the historic preservation?
18	MR. ROBINSON: That that is atypical
19	for the cost of this project.
20	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. Thanks.
21	MR. GLASGOW: Thank you. I would like not
22	to proceed with the next witness, Mr. Bolan.
23	MR. BOLAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
24	members of the Board.
25	For the record, my name is Lewis Bolan

with the firm of Bolan Smart Associates. We're real 2 estate and economic consultants to this project. You've heard the difficulties architecturally and from a construction standpoint and 5 what I'd like to do now is to -- to look at some of the numbers and the -- the economic ramifications of 6 some of the things that you've heard earlier and what 8 I'd like to do is to briefly walk you through three 9 scenarios for this project. 10 One is what I'm calling the "Buy Right" 11 development. What if this project were to -- to 12 proceed without any variance on that? Secondly, what 13 the original request was for variance and -- and the 14 third, what I would call the compromise variance. 15 has to do with the third floor being used for a half 16 office and half residential. 17 And there are a lot --18 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Before you start, do 19 you have something that we could follow along with? Dennis, do you have extra 20 BOLAN: MR. 21 copies of that? What I'd -- what I'd like to -- let me 22 23 wait until you -- until these have been distributed so that you have copies in front of you. 24

Okay.

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, you're going through "Buy Right."

MR. BOLAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The first option and then the revised.

MR. BOLAN: All right. Starting in "Buy Right", what we -- what we've done is we have first estimated the total cost of this project and those costs as you can see on that table are \$8,031,520.

In -- in doing this, you'll -- you'll note that we've used the assess valuation for the land and improvement which is \$629,200 as an input into that and in response to -- to an earlier question that you had, Ms. Mitten, you asked what -- what did the Applicant pay for this property and it was acquired on August 11th, 2000 and the total acquisition cost was \$2,900,000.

But, we have chosen not to use that number in -- in our -- in any of our analyses. Instead relying on the assess valuation. Feeling that that was the more appropriate and more conservative way of proceeding with this project not what the Applicant paid for the property and so, the \$629,200 represents the current appraised -- current assess valuation of the properties in question.

We then said the rehabilitation costs for 20,115 gross square feet of space, and you'll note that we've used a higher cost there, we've used a cost of \$320 per square foot not the \$271 that was referenced by Mr. Robinson earlier and that number again was supplied by -- by Davis Construction.

But, presumably if they were not to expand the building but were to do a smaller building, there would be an additional premium over and above what they had come up with and that's how that \$320 number was arrived at.

And then finally, we've used lease up and soft costs at 15 percent and I -- I would note that that's a very conservative number. That in reality lease up soft costs -- and soft costs would include such things as interim financing fees, permits, architects, legal expenses, interior fit out, brokerage commissions, advertising, marketing, general overhead is normally -- it's the principal categories that are included in those soft costs.

And we've -- I think we've been extremely conservative in using the 15 percent number there. The number that is -- is often used is between 20 and 25 percent. The reason we've chosen to use a low number here is because the architect's fees are

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

included in the construction costs number one and number two because construction interest rates right now and permanent rates are all time low records. We felt that it was warranted to use a low figure.

So, we've come up with a -- with a total cost of \$8,031,520 if this project were developed "Buy Right."

We then looked briefly at the potential income from this and looked at the cash-on-cash return and at the capitalized value of the property using two rates, a 7 percent cap rate and an 8 percent cap rate and I think rather than walk you through this line by line, I think in the interest of time, I'd like to just go to the bottom line there and say that the cash-on-cash return that -- that we've calculated is 4.2 percent which is hardly sufficient to justify any project of this size, this magnitude or this risk level and I'm -- I personally am not aware of any developer who would initiate a project of such complexity if the expected return was a 4.2 percent cash-on-cash return.

And furthermore, when we capitalize this using relatively low capitalization rates of 7 or 8 percent, both suggest a -- a loss on this property. In other words, the total cost is over \$8,000,000 to

develop it, but if the developer upon the completion of this project and successful leasing of it were to turn around and sell it, we would estimate that their loss would be between 3.2 and 3.8 million dollars. So, clearly, there is no basis for -- for proceeding from an economic standpoint on a "Buy Right" basis.

On the -- the second -- the second page which is labeled BSA 2 table 2, we -- we've looked at the redevelopment of this as proposed by -- by Ms. Cohen in her -- in her architectural plans that were just presented to you and there we have a -- a building of 36,291 gross square feet and once again, we've used the same format and the same -- the same level of analysis.

In this case, you'll note that we've used the lower construction cost, the \$271.25 that was referenced earlier by Mr. Robinson. The same 15 percent lease up costs and we come to a total cost for this project of just under \$12,000,000 for the -- for the development of it.

Looking at the income potential, you'll note that we've -- we've assumed a higher rental rate for the retail space and for the office space than was the case in the earlier and we felt that the economies of scale, the critical mass that would be generated by

now doing a larger project would warrant a higher rent and I might add that where -- where those are relatively high rent levels certainly for that area, but we're optimist that a specialized kind of user could be found who would -- who would pay that price.

On -- on the retail \$35 triple net is a relatively high price for that area today, but because it is directly across the street from the -- the Convention Center, we really do feel that -- that that is warranted and that a restaurant or a couple of restaurants of a very high quality could be interested in that. Something similar to what Douglas has done with the -- the District Chop House, for example, would be a good example of the kind of use that we think would be warranted and marketable in that area.

And likewise while this is not conventional office space, you heard Mr. Millstein call it funky space. I don't know if I'd use the word funky, but -- but we think it specialized office we think it could have some very But, substantial appeal to people who do business with the convention center. It is not the kind of space that's firm going to appeal to law trade а or to а association or something of that sort. feel that there are specialized users who we think

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would be very interested in that.

But, continuing there, it would generate in -- in our estimation a net operating income of \$846,000 upon completion which is a cash-on-cash return of 7.1 percent. So, you could see that that's a better yield than the earlier case, but it is still far from an attractive yield and certainly most of the cash-on-cash returns that we look at for the kinds of projects that we're typically involved with show double digit cash-on-cash returns. Is what is typically being asked for.

And once again, we've capitalized that income stream using both a 7 and an 8 percent cap and here the -- the range depending upon which capitalization rate you use ranges from a lost of \$144,000 to a profit of a \$1,367,000.

So, here we -- we do feel at least there's a fighting chance that this project could be -- could be done and could be done successfully and if that lower cap rate were utilized which is not out of line, I think that there is at least some potential here for the developer to -- to have a -- you know, a pretty good profit on the -- on the property.

And the -- the last page in this -- in this attachment simply summarizes the materials that

1	were have just been have just been provided.
2	There's nothing nothing new there.
3	Turning to the the second of the
4	handouts, the the Alternative D, here we've
5	we've changed the the mix of uses to reflect what
6	Mr. Glasgow talked about a little earlier of a sort
7	of a compromise of using the third floor for half
8	residential purposes and half office purposes and once
9	again, we've gone through the same the same
10	here. Showing
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me make sure we
12	have all of this.
13	I have Table 1 which is the "Buy Right."
14	Table 2 which is redevelopment as proposes.
15	MR. BOLAN: Right. Yes. That's right.
16	And Table 3 which is just a summary is the third
17	table.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
19	MR. BOLAN: Then you should also have a
20	second handout called Alternative D.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That I don't have.
22	Here they come.
23	MR. BOLAN: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, to be clear, as
25	proposed is what we've just look. Is the mix on the

1	third floor of residential and commercial.
2	MR. BOLAN: No, that is that is all
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's the original.
4	MR. BOLAN: That is the original
5	submission that has the third floor all office.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Got ya. Okay.
7	MR. BOLAN: Now, what we've done is we've
8	looked at at the you know, what I'd call the
9	compromise position which is having the third floor
10	develop for half residential and half commercial and
11	once again, it's the same format that we've used. The
12	same kind of analysis and we show total development
13	cost for the project of just under \$12,000,000
14	\$11,949,000.
15	We we show a a net operating income
16	under the income of \$830,000 which is a cash-on-cash
17	return of 6.9 percent. In other words, slightly
18	lower.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
20	MR. BOLAN: And the difference is very
21	simple that residential rents are less than office.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
23	MR. BOLAN: That's that's the bottom
24	line and then all this does is just work out the math
25	of that.

98
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MR. BOLAN: Once again, we've capitalized
that at both the 7 and 8 percent capitalization rate,
but here it's just enough to keep it all in the loss
side with a projected loss on sale of between \$89,000
and \$1,500,000.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And it's
it's your you've stated it's your expert opinion in
in the two scenarios of relief requested even as
proposed and then revised as proposed that this is
just one the threshold of being financially feasible.
MR. BOLAN: Under the most optimistic
circumstances, it is just barely feasible. Just
barely.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MR. BOLAN: The the "Buy Right" is
completely impractical in every sense of the word from
a from a financial standpoint.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MR. BOLAN: But, if the relief that is
being requested is applied, then there is at least a
fighting chance that this project could be made
profitable.

in your understanding of the financial feasibility of

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS:

24

25

And how much

1	these things and in your expert opinion, how much
2	how much problems are created with the existing
3	structures? I guess my point is would do the
4	numbers change here if you built a brand new building
5	with a single floor plate, with a, you know, however
6	you wanted to configure it?
7	MR. BOLAN: Oh, if if this was simply a
8	vacant site, we'd do just new construction here, these
9	numbers would be totally different. Number one, the
10	construction costs would be substantially lower.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. That's
12	MR. BOLAN: There's that's that's
13	where you would see the major difference. I don't
14	think you'd see much of a difference on the income
15	side. Presumably, the rents would not be higher or
16	lower.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.
18	MR. BOLAN: But, the
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, you might get
20	that law firm up here.
21	MR. BOLAN: But it's possible.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.
23	MR. BOLAN: But, you're going to get a
24	specialized user I think, you know, in this location.
25	But, where you would see a tremendous difference,

1	instead of a base construction cost of \$271 a square
2	foot, you would be looking at a cost of perhaps half
3	that amount. Something in the neighborhood of \$135 to
4	\$150 a square foot.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
6	MR. BOLAN: Not \$271 square foot.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
8	MR. BOLAN: That's where the problem is.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. Okay.
10	Anything else?
11	MR. BOLAN: No, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent.
13	Questions from the Board. Ms. Miller.
14	MEMBER MILLER: Did you do an analysis
15	with tables like this showing what the profit and
16	costs would be if you adopted OP's recommendation?
17	MR. BOLAN: This does. I believe that the
18	Alternative D does.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, that's what
20	this one
21	MR. BOLAN: Oh, you mean with all doing
22	all residential? It it lowers it. I can tell you
23	that. It does lower.
24	Because what what happens and again,
25	the the answer's a very simple one. The

residential -- we've assumed rent for the residential of \$1.75 a square foot triple net. That would equate to a gross rent today of about \$2.25 to \$2.50 per square foot per month.

But, in order to strip away the operating expenses and taxes and just to see what remains for the developer, that would translate to \$175 per square foot per month. That's \$21 a year. \$1.75 times 12. The office space would rent for more.

So, if you do all residential rather than office, you are definitely having a negative impact on the project and this -- this -- this so-called compromise position using the third floor for half office and half residential, I think does make a -- a financial compromise as well.

But, if you were to do this with all residential, it would definitely have an adverse impact for that reason.

MR. GLASGOW: I think and -- we can have -- Ms. Miller, for ease --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually, before -before he moves on as a room full of experts, there's
often lots of terms that are thrown out. So, let me
have you step back and just briefly describe for the
Board what triple net means and how that -- no, don't

1	or just define it.
2	MR. BOLAN: Okay. Triple net means
3	essentially what goes into the developers pocket.
4	That means it excludes the operating expenses and
5	property taxes for the property. So, when when I
6	said \$1.75 a square foot triple net for for
7	residential, that means that would be left what
8	would be left for the developer after he has paid the
9	operating expenses and taxes for the building.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
11	MR. BOLAN: And the same thing would be
12	true on on office and resident on retail.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And
14	oftentimes, might that include also tenant
15	improvements. That is maybe factored into agreement
16	that would be factored into one of the nets.
17	MR. BOLAN: The tenant improvements
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The first and the
19	second and to the third. I see.
20	MR. BOLAN: The tenant improvements would
21	be included in this. In the the residential, they
21 22	be included in this. In the the residential, they almost invariably are.
22	almost invariably are.
22	almost invariably are. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

in this.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, it's -- what's taken away.

MR. BOLAN: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Thank you.

I'm sorry. Yes.

MR. GLASGOW: And then just very briefly. Thank you.

We had Mr. Bolan just for ease because we were doing a lot of computations after we got the -the report back from the Office of Planning, we kept
the construction costs for BSA Table 2 and Alternative
D the same. Where residential costs more to build
than office does because of the bathrooms and the
kitchens and that type of thing. So, that the numbers
-- while he's got -- he's got those numbers there,
there would be an increased construction cost to
Alternative D versus the BSA Table Number 2. So, that
would spread the difference between the Office of
Planning report of converting the entire floor as
opposed to the table.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I just want to ask a

-- a question about -- you have mentioned that you
went to HPRB. This doesn't really relate to the

1	financial feasibility per se, but you said you went to
2	HPRB with a different proposal initially and then it
3	was pushing they wanted everything pushed back.
4	Would that have entailed variances as
5	well? The original proposal? Let's say
6	notwithstanding parking.
7	MR. GLASGOW: I wasn't at the HPRB
8	hearing. So, I'm looking at our raft of experts.
9	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes is the answer.
11	Okay. Anything else?
12	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. No.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thanks. Any
14	questions on Ms. Miller, any further questions?
15	Very well.
16	Thanks very much, Mr. Bolan.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
17	
17 18	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to
	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to
18	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue
18	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue with respect to the to the parking and the loading.
18 19 20	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue with respect to the to the parking and the loading. That is may be part of the case
18 19 20 21	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue with respect to the to the parking and the loading. That is may be part of the case CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay.
18 19 20 21 22	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue with respect to the to the parking and the loading. That is may be part of the case CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay. MR. GLASGOW: depending upon what the
18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GLASGOW: I'll call the I'd like to call Ms. Cohen back up to address one particular issue with respect to the to the parking and the loading. That is may be part of the case CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay. MR. GLASGOW: depending upon what the Board decides.

looke	ed at parking basically where we would be required
to h	ave 44 parking space, 22 for the existing and 22
for	the new and in order to do that, we we would
have	to have a minimum of three levels of underground
parki	ing and and that's if we went basically back-
to-ba	ack. Just the way the site is so small to get
the t	turning radius and, you know, the drive the 40-
foot	driveway.
	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, in three level
is ac	ctually you could fit 44 spaces?
	MS. COHEN: If if they were back-to-
back	basically. So, that means
	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, so you'd have to
stac	ς.
	MS. COHEN: Unit stacked units.
	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And you'd have a
speed	d ramp down.
	MS. COHEN: It would it would be
diffi	icult. It would be very difficult and there would
have	to be there would have to be an attendant
there	e or somebody to move the car back
	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.
	MS. COHEN: and forth. Otherwise
	MR. GLASGOW: I think to add three levels
of be	elow grade parking

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Underneath
2	MR. GLASGOW: with everything else,
3	yes. I think from an economic feasibility, we have
4	all the issues that we can deal with right now and the
5	parking I think you would need to provide possibly 22
6	spaces because we wouldn't have to provide for the
7	existing building.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The existing.
9	MR. GLASGOW: But, that would still be on
10	two levels.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
12	MR. GLASGOW: Two levels of parking below
13	grade.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
15	MR. GLASGOW: And it would chew up then
16	we'd have to have Mr. Bolan do a further analysis as
17	to what the ramp down and everything does to the first
18	floor and the decrease in the rent and every you
19	know, the lost space there.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Where were you
21	accessing it? From the alley?
22	MS. COHEN: Yes, from the alley.
23	MR. GLASGOW: Is that a ten-foot alley,
24	Ms. Cohen?
25	MS. COHEN: Yes, it is. Which also you

1	can't have two-way traffic. You'd only have one way.
2	MR. GLASGOW: I think we would be in a
3	position to actually make that work. We'd have to
4	come in and demolish one of the facades of the
5	historic buildings. Because you're not going to be
6	able to get in off the ten-foot alley.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right and enter off
8	of whatever that east/west street is. What's the
9	east/west?
10	MR. GLASGOW: N N Street.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's right and
12	MR. GLASGOW: Right. We'd have to take
13	out one of the facades, the historic facades on N
14	Street.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Probably not
16	the most attractive thing to do.
17	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything
19	else?
20	MR. GLASGOW: I think on the loading if
21	you provided a 12 by 30 foot loading berth, that would
22	need to be at the would you provide that off the
23	alley? How would that work?
24	MS. COHEN: Yes, it would have to go up
25	the alley. Yes, it would have to go up the alley as

	108
1	well and I'm not sure
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And the
3	MS. COHEN: where to put it.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: that loading
5	you couldn't put that in the garage?
6	MS. COHEN: No. No.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why?
8	MR. GLASGOW: The 10-foot wide alley you
9	couldn't get the 30-foot truck in.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. You also
11	according to the zoning requirements, you'd have to
12	have a 14-foot clearance to get into that. Correct?
13	Which means you'd have to drop so quickly. The ramp
14	that you have drawn and you're holding up, actually
15	that would be a good submission to put in. Does that
16	comply with the the building code and zoning
17	regulations for, in fact, a grade slope of that ramp?
18	Do you know? If you did that calculation.
19	MS. COHEN: We we did I did this
20	very quickly and I just drew the standard ramp
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
22	MS. COHEN: run. You know, what you
23	would what you would need and I would need
24	approximately 70 feet of of run.
	1

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. COHEN: So, I have to -- I have to do 2 a switch back and it would be a very --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MS. COHEN: -- tight turn. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And your 6 drive -- and all that -- I mean obviously, it was done quickly, but you're fairly secure that you actually 8 have access? Actually, when you submit that 9 because I don't understand how you park in those? 10 MR. GLASGOW: We don't have access -- yes, 11 we don't have access. We don't have required access 12 because she stacked the spaces to increase the number. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Because 14 there's no way to drive back down there. So, what I'm 15 seeing is that you could fit the ramp or you could fit parking. 16 17 MS. COHEN: Right. 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, you couldn't --19 MS. COHEN: It would be difficult to --20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right now as I'm 21 looking at that from a distance, it doesn't look like 22 you could -- you could fit both which seems to make it 23 difficult to put parking below grade. And then with loading and access 24 Okay. 25 and all that obviously if you have to drop for a

clearance that would be required with the zoning, 2 obviously it means you'd drop faster which again 3 indicates that you may have to -- you may have to flip back again to get down to the first level. Okay. 5 I think that's fairly understanding in terms of the -- the -- right. Indeed. 6 Anything else? MR. GLASGOW: I'd like to call Mr. Sher. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. Why don't 10 we do this. Let's take five minutes to stretch our 11 legs and I'm sorry this is being so protracted, but I 12 think we're getting through this fairly quickly. 13 We're going to come back in seven minutes and then we'll get through Mr. Sher and we'll get through OP 14 15 and Governments and then we'll -- maybe we'll get 16 lunch today, but you guys will definitely get out and 17 enjoy the afternoon. 18 All right. We'll be right back. 19 (Whereupon, at 11:58 a.m. off the record 20 until 12:12 p.m.) MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Sher, would you please 21 identify yourself for the record and proceed with your 22 23 testimony? 24 Mr. Chairman, are we ready to proceed or

should -- do we need to wait a minute?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We are absolutely ready to proceed. We will be joined by everybody shortly and let me make a quick note as I delay a little bit while they get up here, but you can move ahead with this.

As we have stated previous, these are always exhaustive memos and it's always appreciated when we get them ahead of time. As all the

always exhaustive memos and it's always appreciated when we get them ahead of time. As all the information actually. It was a great clarity in terms of the -- of Mr. Bolan's testimony which would have, in fact, maybe mitigated questions we initially had. It's been done now, but for further reference, there it is.

Mr. Sher.

MR. SHER: Mr. Chairman, I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum.

MR. SHER: For the record, my name is Steven E. Sher, the Director of Zoning and Land Use Services with the law firm of Holland and Knight.

As -- as I think the Board is aware, I've been getting these in for the most part ahead of time, but this one just didn't make it and I'll -- I'll apologize in advance for the one this afternoon that didn't make it either.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, boy.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. SHER: Now, so, you can shoot me twice
2	today.
3	I think the Board is is
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually, to that in
5	all seriousness, I would submit it now. We do have a
6	quick lunch break which we work through our lunches
7	all the time. So, if it's in, we can probably at
8	least get a head start.
9	MR. SHER: It's in the case.
10	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will get it.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
12	MR. SHER: I think the Board is is sort
13	of familiar enough with with the case to for me
14	to skip where the property is and
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
16	MR. SHER: and what's the condition of
17	the buildings at the moment and so forth and so on.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Are gas
19	stations matter of right in this zone?
20	MR. SHER: Is a gas station a matter of
21	right in a C2 zone? I don't think so. I think it's a
22	special exception.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
24	MR. SHER: But, I'll
	1
25	MR. GLASGOW: It may have been matter of

right when it was built.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. No, indeed.

I was just wondering because there was some testimony
in terms of not putting fenestration on that and I was
thinking well, you know, when's a gas station going to
go away, but that's beside the point.

Go ahead.

MR. SHER: It is a special exception in a C2 zone.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent.

MR. SHER: Just to -- to again reset the stage about what the use is that is proposed for the Board now, it would be retail and service uses on the first floor, office uses on the second floor, office and residential on the third floor, and apartment house or residential on the fourth and fifth floors.

So, we still have a total of 3.75 FAR, but the commercial FAR now proposed is 2.39 and the residential is 1.36. The maximum permitted overall in a C2A district is 2.5 FAR. So, we are in excess of that and continue to need a variance.

The height of the building as proposed is 52 feet 10 3/4 inches. Parking, none is provided.

And let me digress from the outline for a moment to add some calculations that I've done this

NEAL R. GROSS

morning. The existing building, assuming that the first floor had been retail use and the second floor

-- second and third floors for those buildings that had a third floor could have been office use as a matter of right under the C2 zone, would have required 22 parking spaces. The proposed use if the parking requirements apply would require 20 parking spaces for the retail, 19 parking spaces for the office, and five parking spaces for the apartments for a total of 44 if those requirements apply which I do not believe they do.

As far as loading is concerned, no loading would have been required for the previous use of the building. No loading would be required for the office use because it's below the threshold for office. No loading would be required for the apartments because it's below the -- the threshold for apartments. However, the retail use at a little under 7,000 square feet would require one 30-foot berth if a loading berth were require. No service delivery space. Just a 30-foot berth. Again, I -- I don't believe the regulations require that in the current circumstance.

So, what we're seeking is four variances, height 2 feet 10 3/4 inches, FAR 1.25 FAR, the rear yard 15 feet, and as -- as there's a typo in the

1	residential recreation space, I've got too many digits
2	after the comma, but that number is is should be
3	1,144. This is page five, letter D, number 2. 1,144.
4	But, what is now required because we've
5	increased the amount of residential space in the
6	building would be 2,249 rather than 1,449 and so, the
7	variance would be approximately 1,105 square feet
8	instead of 305.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Speaking of
10	residential recreation space, do you want to
11	clearly there's been evidence in terms of the
12	Convention Center that's right next door and they I
13	imagine have some interior spaces which one might
14	but, what else is around the area just very briefly in
15	terms of outdoor recreation.
16	MR. GLASGOW: I think Mr. Padro is going
17	to talk about a new community center that's just been
18	built when he testifies.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You calling him as a
20	witness?
21	MR. GLASGOW: He's certainly a witness in
22	support of the application we understand.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. But, you're
24	not calling let's just put it into your testimony.
25	MR. SHER: Okay. Then

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Can you tell me what
2	park is close by?
3	MR. SHER: The the what used
4	to be called the Kennedy Playground and I'm not sure
5	if it's still named that or not. On 7th Street.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
7	MR. SHER: At O. Roughly is the site of
8	the I think they're building it. Mr. Glasgow was
9	just referring to. It's two
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Within two blocks?
11	MR. SHER: It's a block and a half over
12	and a block up.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And it has open
14	area, playground equipment?
15	MR. SHER: It's open and enclosed
16	community center building.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
18	MR. SHER: That's the nearest building or
19	or district facility that I know of that's right
20	there. There are some of the federal reservations as
21	you go further down towards Mass Avenue, but that's
22	three blocks already as you get down from the whole
23	length of the Convention Center. You got Mt. Vernon
24	Square and other things, but that's a ways away.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. SHER: So. I think the Board is -- is familiar generally with the standards for a variance and -- and on page five -- six, I've -- I've looked at the question of exceptional or extraordinary situation, the practical difficulty, and the detriment to the public good as it relates to all four of the variances.

I think that -- that in -- in summary, you've heard this from the previous witnesses, the five separate buildings which contribute to the character of the historic district, the different floor levels in the exterior designs, the extremely dilapidated condition and -- and one factor that I'm not sure was put in -- in this context, the fact that the distance between the rear of the buildings and the rear lot line is only 35 to 40 feet. So, you've got -- don't have a tremendous amount of area at the back on which you could build something. Again, it goes back to ramps for parking if you were thinking about trying to do parking.

Where you put the core of the building which logically seems to get pushed to the back of the building so you don't disrupt the floor plates anymore than you have to, the requirement of HPRB to push the building back, so, you're pushing the bulk to the east

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

as opposed to where it might otherwise be if this were a non-incumbered site.

or did not have contributing buildings. I think the

-- the difficulties of developing the site would be
significantly less which then goes to the issues I've
related to under practical difficulty and -- and the
testimony of -- of the cost related to preserving
these particular buildings not buildings in general,
but these particular buildings and the amount of
density that can be built behind them to -- to sustain
those costs or to help offset those costs, we just
don't believe that it can be done within 2.5 FAR and
-- and based on the materials that's I've reviewed, I
don't believe it can be done within that amount of
density either.

As to the public good, the height is a minimal variance. It's the minimum necessary to get those two floors in there. Otherwise, you'd be trying to get two floors in 15 feet which would allow only very short people or a -- or -- or just -- it wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be possible or practical to do because of the way the building's set back. The height in the mass is not visible from most locations.

The C2A district does allow and encourage

1	mixed use projects. HPRB has approved the design and
2	so forth.
3	So, looking at the tests of the
4	regulations and the statute and looking at the facts
5	of this case, I believe that the Applicant has made a
6	case that these variance meet those tests and the
7	application should be granted.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well.
9	Questions from the Board? Not hearing any, thanks
10	very much.
11	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman, did the Board
12	want a copy of this rough drawing that was done of the
1.0	parking?
13	parking:
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
14 15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this?
14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this?
14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are
14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are fine. I mean as you've evidenced it, it needs to go
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are fine. I mean as you've evidenced it, it needs to go into the record.
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are fine. I mean as you've evidenced it, it needs to go into the record. Okay. Anything else? Any other
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are fine. I mean as you've evidenced it, it needs to go into the record. Okay. Anything else? Any other witnesses?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. MR. GLASGOW: All right. You don't need the original. We can get you a copy of this? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, yes, copies are fine. I mean as you've evidenced it, it needs to go into the record. Okay. Anything else? Any other witnesses? MR. GLASGOW: Those are that completes

MR. MOORE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and 2 members of the Board. In the essence of time, the Office of Planning supports 3? of the variance requests the 5 Applicant is seeking. The only difference being that a total 6 nonresidential FAR that the Applicant has addressed 8 this morning and it sounds positive. However, the 9 Office of Planning would reserve the right with the 10 Board's approval of course, to do a supplement that 11 will address that. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Can you --13 MR. MOORE: In whatever time frame you 14 want us to do it in. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I think that makes some logical, but let me understand. 16 wouldn't mind just adding a little more information to 17 your reasoning behind increasing the residential and 18 19 specifically the placement of the residential. 20 We were looking at more or MR. MOORE: 21 less the distribution and trying to be as close to the 22 regulations as possible. 2.5 of which no more than 23 1.5 should be nonresidential and originally as proposed the nonresidential component I think it was 24 25 about double what the residential would have been.

1	And in terms of building neighborhoods, we
2	although we know it is not financially as
3	supportable as commercial would be, we believe that
4	people who live in communities build neighborhoods and
5	so, we want to maximize to the extent possible and
6	stay as close to the regs as possible the residential
7	component versus the nonresidential component in the
8	building.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, if I
10	understand you correctly, you're saying in a C2A zone
11	clearly it's laid out to emphasize or encourage more
12	residential or to other uses and that's what you're
13	trying to do in this mix.
14	MR. MOORE: Which is exactly what we're
15	trying to achieve.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Okay. Any
17	other questions from the Board?
18	MEMBER MILLER: I have a question.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
20	MEMBER MILLER: When OP does it's
21	analysis, does it take into account economic
22	feasibility or is it just doing it from an ideal
23	standpoint?
24	MR. MOORE: To be perfectly honest with
25	you, Ms. Miller, when we first did it, it was based on

	122
1	two parameters, one being the the recommendations
2	of HP and the other being economic considerations and
3	anticipating that very question, this second was
4	kicked out.
5	So, no, we didn't use economic feasibility
6	in our analysis.
7	MEMBER MILLER: When you're going back to
8	do your supplemental report, is that something you
9	will take into consideration or or
10	MR. MOORE: In light of what was presented
11	today, yes, we will.
12	MEMBER MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Any other
14	questions from the Board?
15	Office of Planning, does the Applicant
16	have any cross examination questions?
17	MR. GLASGOW: No, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: ANC any cross
19	examination of the Office of Planning? None. Very
20	well.
21	Thank you very much. We appreciate it.
22	It's an excellent report. I'm glad you also
23	summarized. It is very clear in its submission for
24	us.
25	There we are. We do also have the
	1

123 Department of Transportation report. We actually have two if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct? We have Exhibit Number 27 and then a second supplemental that came in. I think we received this this morning. correct? Right. Mr. Glasgow, do you -- you -- you have both of these. Correct? MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Can you summarize? MR. GLASGOW: The first report indicated that it did not -- that -- that DDOT did not support the project based -- if the applications -- if 2100.5 was not applicable and that it would be governed by

It said that -- right at the end, it says 2100.6. under 2100.6 accordingly, DDOT does not support the application as currently proposed.

Then after receiving the information as to 2100.5 and the Historic -- that the buildings did contribute to the historic district, I'm now to the second report, the May 19th report. accordingly, DDOT has no objection to the application.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. GLASGOW: And they also did note the issues with the alley access because you've got a 10foot wide alley.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Are you anticipating doing loading zones around this building?

MR. GLASGOW: Yes, what -- yes, and we talked to them about that and they referenced that in -- in their report. Just -- and they recognize when

we had the -- we had a conference call with them that Mr. Moore was part of and they recognized that it -- as a commercially zoned piece of property with street frontage, we have the right to request a -- a loading zone and that we would work with the portion of DDOT that -- that issues that. Since we have a corner lot

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

and we can go one of two places --

MR. GLASGOW: -- we would just work to them -- work with them as to where the loading zone is.

Loading zones are generally 40 feet in length. Required loading berth is 30 feet in length. So, we felt very comfortable with that.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And I think we take a look at I mean all of this in the whole application and somewhat with a third test of -- of the variances, but that to me -- an -- an embellishment in my mind is how it fits within the neighborhood and we look at an existing use of retail

or let's say commercial and residential on a wide
street, 9th as evidence in the record of the the
aerial photographs and it seems like it could easily
accommodate street loading without I mean not being
on the magnitude of something like the Convention
Center where you're going to have all of those trucks
which obviously they've accommodated in their site.
So, there it is. I think the DDOT report
is fairly clear and they are anticipating that you'll
make further provisions in accommodating their
realities of loading both the residential and the
and the commercial.
MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir, and we did in the
the trash area that they talk about in the back
because we do have the climatized trash area that
operates the way that they want it to.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Which in
your written report you didn't bring that up this
morning, but obviously, it goes to vector control.
MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. It's a great
word actually throwing around there.
MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes, we are anti-rat.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. Okay. Any
other questions of that? Clarity on the Department of

Transportation's report?

Then let's move on to ANC-2C and we do have the representative here who we've kept here all morning.

MR. PADRO: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board.

For the record, I'm Alexander M. Padro.

I'm Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner for ANC Single

Member District 2C01 in Shaw where this property is located.

And I have three documents that I would like to present to the Board this afternoon.

The first is a letter of support for this application from Ward 2 Council Member Jack Evans. This was supposed to have been messengered over yesterday but ended up being faxed over. It's been received by the office and I have copies to distribute.

I also have a letter which I have prepared, original on top, copies underneath, summarizing -- actually I got bottom wrong -- summarizing community outreach efforts regarding this project and some historic preservation issues.

And then lastly, I have a letter from Shaw Main Streets, Inc. of which I serve as the Chair of

1	the Board of Directors which has also taken a position
2	on this.
3	And and I would appreciate the Chair's
4	and the Board's indulgence in trying to consolidate
5	the two sets of remarks that I am presenting to you
6	this morning from the ANC perspective and from the
7	commercial revitalization perspective of Shaw Main
8	Streets, Inc.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The Shaw Main Street
10	is one of the newly designated main streets. Is that
11	correct?
12	MR. PADRO: Correct. The Shaw Main
13	Streets, Inc., a nonprofit organization, was formed in
14	March of 2002.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
16	MR. PADRO: And was designated on May the
17	7th to participate in the D.C. Main Streets program.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent.
19	MR. PADRO: So, with your indulgence.
20	I will not read these letters into the
21	record. You can refer to them. I will bring little
22	salient points.
23	Before I do that, I do have two points
24	that I would like to make clarifications on Mr. Sher's
25	testimony. Some additional information that perhaps

he did not have at his disposal or was not included and should have been included.

This goes to page two of the outline of his testimony. Roman numeral II, item E, uses to the east. In addition to the uses that are stipulated, there is an additional small office building at 1300 7th Street, NW which was formerly the Seventh Street Savings Bank and there are two row houses on the 1300 block of 8th Street on the east side adjacent to Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church which serve as a church rectory and also as -- as rental office space.

And to address the issue of recreation space available in the neighborhood, this goes to page three of the outline Roman Numeral III, item G. I'd like to briefly enumerate the active recreation spaces that are available in the area.

First, the Kennedy Recreation Center which is the -- the new name for the Kennedy Playground located on the square bounded by 6th, 7th, 0, and P Streets, NW will be opening at the end of June. That represents a \$4.5 million investment on the part of the District government to provide increased recreation opportunity in the community. It includes a -- a large building which has a gymnasium, a weight

room, classrooms, lockers, showers, and improvements to the grounds which include tennis courts, outdoor basketball courts, sprinklered recreation space for children, and two playgrounds in addition to the existing barbecue grove and baseball diamond.

Additional recreation spaces in the area are located at the Shaw Recreation Center which is at the west side of Shaw Junior High School at 925 Rhode Island Avenue. That consists of two tennis courts, one outdoor basketball court, a soccer field, and another large field as well as indoor recreation space that is shared space with the gymnasium for the school.

There is also a soccer field, baseball field, and basketball area behind Seaton Elementary School which is located directly to the south of the Shaw Junior High School and then lastly, at Bundy Elementary School on the 400 block of N Street, NW there is also a large playing field that is used for soccer as well as baseball.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, you're saying that people in the area are in good shape?

MR. PADRO: We have a -- a great deal -- a great number of options in terms of -- of active recreation space and we're very grateful to the

Williams' administration for the improvements at the Kennedy Playground which is again just, you know, one block away from the subject property. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. MR. PADRO: So, onto ANC considerations. a location which has, you know, had the is attention of the community for a very long time. was, you know, a very actively used retail space, a number of different businesses that were in active operation until the economic downturn that began in 1960s was exacerbated by the 1968 riots following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the subsequent decades of disinvestment in this corridor. the time that Douglas Development Αt acquired the property, it was inhabited by squatters that were using it to engage in illegal activities including drug sales and use and prostitution. frequently visited frequent location bу Metropolitan Police Department and it was --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Hopefully to stop those activities. MR. PADRO: Yes, indeed. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. PADRO: In response to calls for

service.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed.

MR. PADRO: Not to partake. And so, it was a -- a great relief to the community that, you know, Douglas Development acquired this property. To be quite honest with you, the level of deterioration in the buildings really did lead us to believe that some of these squatters and trespassers were going to end up being killed because there would be a roof collapse.

And previous owners made minimal attempts to try to secure the property. The property was not properly secured and as a result the incursions and intrusions continued to take place.

So, upon the acquisition of the property by Douglas Development which is regarded as one of the most preservation sensitive and preservation oriented development companies working in the District of Columbia, the community began a dialogue with Douglas Development about what they would like to see happen with this important corner taking into account the fact that it was going to be directly across the street from the new Washington Convention Center, an \$834 million investment in our community and taking into account the fact that there was a long held desire among community residents to have, you know, a

restoration of the traditional uses, commercial uses along 7th and 9th Streets.

These two streets developed as has been stated previously in the years during and following the Civil War along the streetcar lines that ran through the neighborhood. This originally was, you know, beyond the area where development had been taking place and it was only with the addition of this -- at -- at that time new means of transportation that development began to be spurred.

And the pattern of development, you know, typically was to have retail establishments on the ground floor and -- and residential above and that is something that in these lean years in the last half of the 20th century began to be disrupted to the point where at present there is very little retail along these blocks. That has begun to change as -- as some minor private investment has started in the area.

You know, nonetheless, you've heard already about the significant deterioration, the fact that Ward 2 Neighborhood Services Coordinator Clark Ray had made efforts with the Ward 2 Core Team to bring District government resources to bear on a severely blighted building that was, you know, representing, you know, a possible threat to health

and safety and those were instigated by myself as a result of -- of concerns about what might happen there if the property was not properly secured.

Working with this District agencies including the Historic Preservation Review Board and DCRA and Douglas Development, you know, the decisions that were made in terms of removing portions of the rears of these buildings, you know, were made and the buildings stabilized, completely secured so that there would not be any further intrusions and, you know, the process of community outreach, you know, began.

Now, I would -- you know, I want to emphasize the extensive community outreach that has been undertaken on this project because of its, you know, very important location, but also because of it's very important role in the restoration of the Shaw Historic District. This is one of the key corners in the -- in the historic district. If you look at the map of the Shaw Historic District, you will see that there are a great number of perforations in the historic fabric.

And because some of the oldest buildings in the entire district are included in this particular lot, you know, residents and especially those that are, you know, concerned about preservation issues saw

this as being, you know -- you know, a project that we could not afford to lose a single square inch of historic fabric.

You know, as a result, there was quite a bit of -- of discussion and -- and concern about the material that had to be removed from the buildings in order to stabilize them, but nonetheless, that -- the consensus was that, you know, it was more -- it's certainly preferable, you know, to -- to maintain what historic fabric was there, not lose anymore and we were grateful to have a developer who was not inclined to simply go ahead with DCRA's initial inclination and simply raze this item and have a -- a type of a -- for development.

So, as you'll see in -- in my written statements, a number of public meetings were held. I arranged those as part of the -- the monthly meetings that I hold as a matter of course for my constituents to be able to hear presentations from developers and from District government agencies about issues of concern and proposals and going back to November of -- of 2001, we began having meetings to discuss the future of this site in which Douglas Development was a participant.

And on the basis of the discussions at

these meetings as well as surveys that I had begun conducting in August of 2000 -- in the year 2000 to determine the types of retail that were most desired by community residents in the area. You know, we were able to -- to come to the conclusion which was supported by Douglas Development that there were three priorities for the reuse of this property.

The first was, you know, the provision of retail space, the second of commercial space, and then thirdly residential space.

The reason for that hierarchy is that, you know, the -- the greatest need right now is for retail space. Currently, you know, the majority of the retail spaces along 7th and 9th Streets that are in historic properties are not in the condition to be occupied and it is felt that this would be -- this project would be a clear signal, some would say a catalyst or keystone in stimulating that redevelopment of those types of -- of properties that floor do have ground retail space has that commercial traditionally been made available for activities to show that it can be done.

Now, of course, you know, it turns out that this is probably the most expensive of -- of all those opportunities to -- to have -- be the -- the

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

first such project, but -- but nonetheless, because of its -- its critical location, that was the primary recommendation.

Secondary recommendation is for office space and the reason for that is because of -- of decisions that were made on -- on higher levels. During the late 1970s and late 1980s, there was a shift from this traditional mixed use, you know, two storied development paradigm and three in the neighborhood towards high density residential and that primarily happened on 7th Street and -- and it's in evidence on, you know, the Immaculate Conception high rise that is mentioned in the report as being directly to the east as well as Gibson Plaza, Washington Apartments, Lincoln Westmoreland, Kelsey Gardens, et cetera. Primarily along upper 7th Street.

Many spaces that had been used for, you know, doctors' offices, lawyer -- lawyers' offices, accountants' offices, other professional office spaces very often on upper floors of -- of the two and three storied buildings that previously occupied these sites, you know -- you know, were lost in that process and is seen as being a priority to bring that back.

The reason that residential was felt to be a lesser priority in this particular instance was

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because there is such high density residential right near by and there are other abandoned properties in close proximity that are being purchased for rehabilitation and residential occupancy and as a result, that was the reason why it was not felt that residential at this particular site was as important although it was seen as being desirable as part of the mix to restore the historic relationship.

In the -- in the process of developing the recommendations and working with Douglas Development and dealing with the Historic Preservation Review Board staff, we went from a situation where the -- the construction -- new construction was actually going to go all the way up to the facade on 9th Street which was actually supportable historically because directly across the street there were structures that -- that had that pattern of development, subsequent addition of third, fourth, fifth stories atop three story buildings.

But, nonetheless, HPRB as you've heard previously had asked in a departure from past practice to pull all of that development off. That, you know, was once again presented to the community at another meeting in December of 2002 and that proposal received the ANC's support when it went to the Historic

Preservation Review Board.

And I think it's important to note that at the Historic Preservation Review Board hearing the statement was made by the chairman, Tersh Boasberg, that obviously what the Board was asking the developer to do would require zoning relief and there was a specific statement made from the bench by Mr. Boasberg that whether it's, you know, valid for him to have made it or not, that — that the Board would support the BZA application which would allow the Board's — the Historic Preservation Review Board's decisions, you know, to be implemented.

So --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That would set up some sort of system that we would then support their design which means --

MR. PADRO: It's interesting. Isn't it?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- perhaps we look at that and -- well, maybe not.

MR. PADRO: It's sort of a tautology that, you know --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, you know, directness -- I mean we appreciate that. They need to do what they need to do.

MR. PADRO: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not sure their messages or their support of applications fit without our tests in looking at them.

MR. PADRO: Understood. So, finally, you have in the record the report from ANC-2C's meeting on May the 7th, 2003 where the commission unanimously approved the zoning -- Board of Zoning Adjustment application which would allow this project to move forward.

Now, the -- the reason that the community feels so strongly about granting of this relief to allow this project to move forward in addition to the, you know, the critical role that we see development playing the particular as in revitalization of 9th Street is that, you know, we do believe that were it not for this developer stepping in at this particular time, we would be dealing with an empty corner that would need to be redeveloped.

other developers to There are no my been actively knowledge and I've involve in preservation in the city since 1997 and specifically focusing on this community that would even entertain a project of this magnitude considering the huge amount of expenditure and complexity in maintaining as much as possible of the historic fabric of these buildings.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This is a neighborhood that during urban renewal faced losses of -- of entire blocks at a time and fought that very strongly. We've always sought to find the balance between, you know, preservation and the maintenance of the historic character of our neighborhood and, you know, the need for progress and for development and quite simply we see it -- we see preservation and development as not being mutually exclusive.

This is a very special set of circumstances obviously because of the condition of the buildings, of the constraints of the site, but nonetheless, you know, this is a project that probably is -- will be unique in terms of the number of types of relief that it will require. Looking at, you know, the rest of the historic fabric along these blocks, there are no parallel situations that I can think of that would require this number of different, you know, types of relief.

And, you know, again, in -- in order to make this practical and feasible, you know, both the ANC as well as, you know, Shaw Main Streets urge that the -- the BZA grant the relief that has been requested.

To be quite honest with you, if this

NEAL R. GROSS

project does not move forward, we will be dealing with a cleared site because just simply demolition by neglect will cause that to happen. We don't have, you know, provisions in, you know, District law to force a developer to, you know, pin a facade and to go to extreme measures to insure that there is no further, you know, loss of -- of historic fabric. These buildings will fall apart, you know, of their own if they are not aggressively and quickly stabilized and development proceed with them.

So, with that, I thank you for allowing me to go into probably more detail than you wanted to hear about community positions on this.

I will also say that I have gone, you know, door-to-door and spoken with as many of the neighboring property owners, homeowners, businesses as possible to keep them apprised, show them plans for this new project and we have had no concerns in terms of -- of additional parking stresses.

I have actually taken some of them down to the 7th and 8th Street location that has been mentioned several times as being a model development by Douglas Development to show, you know, how loading has been handled, how vector control has been achieved through extraordinary measures on Douglas

Development's part and, you know, we've been able to -- to satisfy, you know, each and every person contacted that this is something that will be a benefit to their immediate neighborhood as well as to the 7th and 9th Street corridors overall. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you very much. We appreciate that. That is quite extensive involvement obviously that you've had which we're well aware of. I think there's some critical pieces that you bring up that actually do inform very well several of the important keys to the variances of course going to the public good and speaking about how bringing about the retail that was original how that fits into the new main street and the purposes of the main street and also in terms of the direction the ANC was looking at. Any questions from the Board at this time? Clarifications? MEMBER MILLER: I do -- I do have a question. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, Ms. Miller. MEMBER MILLER: Just for clarification on record, I really enjoyed listening the testimony and hearing from the community, but I just

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

want to clarify for whom you were speaking. On whether or not you were speaking for ANC-2C or for 2 your own -- for ANC-2C01 or your own views. I see we have a letter in the record from 5 the ANC that a public hearing was held and a vote was 6 taken at which a quorum was present supporting the application. 8 With respect to your remarks though, I 9 don't see in the record a similar kind of document 10 authorizing you to testify on behalf of the ANC. MR. PADRO: And that probably, you know, 12 should have been prepared and as a result of it not 13 being, you know, in the record, you know, my remarks, 14 you know, will reflect my position as the Advisory 15 Neighborhood Commissioner with jurisdiction in 16 addition to that other hat that I wear in terms of 17 Shaw Main Streets and again, that's why I asked for 18 the Board's indulgence. 19 MEMBER MILLER: Thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else? Mr. Glasgow, any questions? 22 MR. GLASGOW: No questions. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Thank 24 you very much. I appreciate your patience in being 25 down here all morning with us.

3

11

1	That is all the government report, ANC
2	reports that I have attended to. Obviously, Mr. Padro
3	has also delivered a a letter from the council
4	member in the ward where the property is located which
5	we will put into the record and give an exhibit to.
6	Let's move on then. Is anyone here
7	attended to Application 17012 in support or in
8	opposition to give testimony today either in support
9	or opposition? Now, would be your time. Not seeing
10	anyone approach the table, I think we can move on to
11	any quick closing remarks you have.
12	MR. GLASGOW: I I think that there is
13	just one I guess housekeeping matter. Is the timing
14	of the OP submission. When that would when that
15	would be available from Mr. Moore.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You want to use that
17	as your closing remarks or you
18	MR. GLASGOW: I'm just asking a question
19	there as to the timing
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
21	MR. GLASGOW: on that and then I'll
22	proceed from there.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: All right. Well,
24	here's the here's the situation which I'm trying to
25	glean from the Board. Also, we have that one other

issue whether we wanted to take on this monumental task of arguing today or not.

I would anticipate this that we set this for decision making at our next meeting. That would not be the -- this coming Tuesday but in two weeks. Set it for a special public and -- and take that up.

What we can do is get submissions and they'll be brief submissions that we'll need. I -- I don't think we need anything more exhaustive on this and that was what we'd require Office of Planning to put a supplemental report. Unless they have major difficulties to do with that, I would anticipate that they'd be able to turn that around in that amount of time.

Is that correct? Okay.

That's pretty much the direction I think I'd like to take at this point.

MR. GLASGOW: I think just with respect to -- to the closing statement we believe that -- that the evidence and -- and testimony that we presented on the record here on each and everyone of the variances that has been requested has been met.

We are looking forward to the -- to the Office of Planning report. We hope that that is supportive, but irrespective of the Office of Planning

NEAL R. GROSS

report, at this point in time, we do believe that we have met the burden of proof.

And as Ms. Miller indicated that they had not taken into account the economic issues that we face in coming up with the -- with the proposal that we put forward today and we do appreciate the work that we've had with Mr. Moore and working through how it is to try to come up with a -- a third floor development option that would best meet the -- the issues that they raised in their report and what our needs are.

We also would like to have -- we would like to have some flexibility as long we do not decrease the amount of residential square footage on the third floor to reconfigure or reorient any of those units because we were -- we were working with Office of Planning on some fairly tight time frames. So, as long as we do not decrease the square footage of residential that we proposed on the third floor, we would like to have flexibility as to the final layout of those units.

And unless there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything further on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Any -- any

last questions from the Board? Clarifications? Very well.

Well, I think that -- well, I know we have -- we'll set this for decision making at our next meeting which is two weeks from today and we will have a deliberative session at that point, but I do want to summarize.

First of all, I appreciate you -- you bringing down all the information and witnesses that you did because it did bring great clarity to a lot of the arguments that were set forth in the original application.

It hasn't been said by the Board and perhaps I speak individually, but I concur with the -the community's opinion and some of the other witnesses in terms of the value of doing a development of this type even though it is so cumbersome both in price and in -- just in timing, but the value of preserving and saving existing edifices that are mixed use and -- and were and were good urban models and -and we are trying to rediscover those in many of our cities in many of our areas. So, it makes absolutely no sense to do away with them and so, I think -- I think this Applicant should be somewhat applauded in taking on the burden of pulling this together.

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	That being said, we will go to two weeks
2	from today. I would keep the record open.
3	Mr. Glasgow, if you wanted to address the
4	parking again, if you wanted to do a supplemental,
5	obviously we are not requiring nor are we requesting a
6	lengthy briefing on that, but if additional
7	information is is wanted to be provided, that would
8	be appreciated.
9	We will look for the Office of Planning's
10	supplemental report.
11	And anything else that we needed? Any
12	other Board members that I don't think we've
13	brought up anything, but any other additional
14	information? In which case
15	MR. GLASGOW: The supplemental memos both
16	from us on parking and from OP would be due what day?
17	MR. MOY: Wednesday, that would be May the
18	28th. Because our mail would be for June the 3rd,
19	our mail out would be the to the Board members on
20	the 29th, but
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's a week from
22	tomorrow.
23	MR. GLASGOW: Week tomorrow. Possibly if
24	we even had a little bit shorter in case anybody
25	needed to respond to somebody else's memo.

	149
1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In terms of
2	responding to the Office of Planning.
3	MR. GLASGOW: I'm trying to yes, I'm
4	trying to push it. Yes, I don't think that there will
5	there will need to be a response, but in the event
6	that there is.
7	Mr. Moore, did you
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Moore, how
9	quickly could you get your supplemental in?
10	MR. MOORE: I like the 28th.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. The 28th.
12	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Mr. Chairman
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I mean just to be
15	fair to the Office of Planning, the to the extent
16	that they're also going to be addressing financial
17	feasibility, they have they have never seen the
18	the analysis before and
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. The
20	information that's coming out.
21	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: you know, it
22	takes time to absorb these things and respond. So,
23	you know, I I think it's fair to give them until
24	the 28th.
25	MR. GLASGOW: The packet's going out the

1	29th and and if we had any response, we would file
2	on the 29th?
3	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I mean I think
4	there is some degree of flexibility there.
5	MR. GLASGOW: No, I just I just want to
6	make sure what the date is. I'm not complaining
7	about. If it's the 29th, it's the 29th. That's okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We could get it
9	okay. In the reality of the situation if there is and
10	we won't do this with all applications, but this is
11	clearly a small issue. It seems like your
12	supplemental or response would be a faxable document.
13	I think we could have that if it's into
14	the Office of Zoning by opening Monday. They can get
15	it to the Board Monday which would give us a brief
16	time but some time to look at it before our Tuesday
17	session and the Monday date is? What is the Monday?
18	MR. MOY: That's the second.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The second.
20	MR. MOY: June 2nd.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And that's if
22	it's needed of course. You're not required to respond
23	to it if you don't need to.
24	All right. That being said, are we clear
25	on submission dates? We know what we're doing.

	151
1	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. Excellent.
3	Okay. In which case, do we have anything else, Mr.
4	Moy?
5	MR. MOY: That's it for the cases in the
6	morning, sir.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very good. Then
8	this will conclude the morning session of 20 May 2003.
9	In terms of the afternoon, we are at 1:00.
10	We have run over this morning. We will be taking
11	just a very brief, but we have business to conduct.
12	So, we will be back in 45 minutes.
13	(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at
14	1:00 p.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	